

Modern Philology

VOL. III

April, 1906

No. 4

EDWARD GRIMESTON, TRANSLATOR AND SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

The twenty-third volume of the *Dictionary of National Biography* contains six "lives" of persons bearing the surname Grimston, or its variants, Grymeston and Grimeston. Among these is an Edward Grim(e)ston, who was the father of the subject of the present sketch. This Edward Grimeston *père* was born about 1528, and had a sufficiently eventful career. He was appointed comptroller of Calais in 1552, was taken prisoner at the capture of the town in 1558, and lodged in the Bastille, from which he escaped in the following year. Later in life he revisited France under pleasanter conditions, and in 1587 acted as secretary to the English ambassador in Paris. In 1557 he had bought from the crown the manor of Rishangles in Suffolk, and on his death in 1599 was buried in the parish church of that place.

He had two surviving sons, both called Edward.¹ The elder of these became member of Parliament for Eye in 1588, married Joan, daughter of Thomas Risby, and died in 1610. He was the father of the first Sir Harbottle Grimston, and grandfather of the second Sir Harbottle, the well-known parliamentary orator, who became speaker and master of the rolls.

But it is with the younger of the two brothers that this article deals. It is remarkable that he is not thought worthy of being

¹Cf. Davy's *Suffolk Collections*, Vol. LVII, p. 204; *MS. Add.* 19, 133; and *Harleian Society's Publications*, Vol. XIII, p. 207.

mentioned in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, even among his father's descendants, for he was one of the most active and versatile of translators, when translation was in its golden age, and he was sergeant-at-arms during one of the most stirring periods of English parliamentary history. He has been, in fact, so completely forgotten that it was quite indirectly that my attention was drawn to him. In investigating the historical sources of Chapman's *Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* and his two Byron plays I found that the dramatist had taken as his authority Grimeston's *General Inventorie of the Historie of France*, published in 1607, which is mainly an English version of Jean de Serres's *Inventaire Général de l' Histoire de France*, but which also contains passages from other writers, especially Pierre Matthieu and P. V. Cayet. Of this volume I gave some account in the *Athenæum* for January 10, 1903, and I propose to deal here with Grimeston's career and work on a wider scale.

The entries under his name in the *British Museum Catalogue* fall little short of twenty, including later augmented editions of some of his publications. These all contain more or less elaborate dedicatory letters to patrons, and some have in addition addresses to the reader. They thus furnish some internal evidence from which, in combination with meager external data, Edward Grimeston's career can be partly reconstructed.

I have not hitherto been able to ascertain the exact date of his birth, or any details about his early life. Perhaps some scholar, whose bent lies toward genealogical research, may be stimulated to investigate the matter more fully. There is no record, as far as I have been able to ascertain, of his having been a member of either of the universities, and it is not till he had reached manhood that his own utterances throw light upon his occupations and aims. We know, however, that at some period he married a daughter of "Strettly, *Armiger*."¹

As a member of a distinguished family, he naturally aspired to an important official career, and in the closing decade of the sixteenth century he was sent, like his father, to France, probably in some diplomatic capacity. This is evident from two of his own

¹ Cf. *The Visitation of Essex in 1612* (Harl. Soc. Publications, Vol. XIII, p. 207).

statements. In the dedication of the *General Inventorie* (1607) to the Earls of Suffolk and Salisbury he speaks of having retired to "private and domesticke cares" after "some years expence in France for the publike service of the State," and in his "Epistle to the Earl of Suffolk" prefixed to *The Estates, Empires and Principalities of the World* (1615) he enters into further detail:

After eight yeares spent for the publique service of this Estate in France, seeing my Starre without light in our Horizon, and the hopes of my service, or of further imployments dead, I retired my selfe to this fruitlesse course of life [i. e., translation] to the end I might deceive the houres of my idle time, and leaue some testimonie to the world of my liues imployment.

It was probably not long after Elizabeth's death that Grimeston's "idle time" began, for in 1604 his first translations were published, and in one of them, *The Naturall and Morall Historie of the East and West Indies*, he speaks of "the advantage I have gleaned from idle houres, in exchanging this Indian History from Spanish to English." The original is from the pen of the Spanish Jesuit, Joseph de Acosta, born in 1540, who spent upward of seventeen years in Peru and Mexico, and embodied the results of observations in his *Historia natural y moral de las Indias*, published at Seville in 1590. The earlier part of the work deals mainly with questions of physical geography and ethnology, mingled with curious speculations by the author; the latter and more valuable books are a first-hand record of Peruvian and Mexican customs and beliefs, which is of enduring interest and importance. Grimeston showed a happy instinct in choosing the work for translation, and his version has had the honor of republication (in 1880) by the Hakluyt Society. Sir Clement Markham, who edits the reprint, bears witness that, though "there are some omissions and occasional blunders, the translation is on the whole creditable and trustworthy." Unfortunately, however, he confuses the translator with Edward Grimeston, the comptroller of Calais, who had been dead for five years in 1604. A less important production of Grimeston's pen in the same year was *A true historie of the Memorable Siege of Ostend* (the siege which began in July, 1601, and ended in September, 1604), translated from

the French, and dedicated to the able lord lieutenant of Ireland, Charles Mountioie, whose name is turned into the complimentary anagram "One: A most Rich Iuel." The work which was published by Edward Blount,¹ contains two curious plates illustrating episodes in the siege.

Grimeston's next two translations belong to 1607, and were both printed by George Eld. One of them was a version, with some slight omissions, of Simon Goulart's² *Histoires admirables et memorables de nostre temps*. Goulart, who was a prominent French Protestant ecclesiastic, was as indefatigable a translator and compiler as Grimeston himself, and it was apparently at his suggestion that the collection of "Histories" was put into English. For in his dedication to Sir Walter Cope, Grimeston states that "at the request of my friend I undertooke the translation of this worke³ the title wherof shewes the subiect to be extraordinarie." The volume is in effect, a farrago of sensational episodes drawn from very varied sources, and it is somewhat surprising that an age so greedy of marvels was apparently satisfied with one edition of the work in its English dress.

Far more solid and memorable was the other product of Grimeston's pen in the same year.⁴ It was the translation, spoken of above, of Jean de Serres's *Inventaire Général de l'Histoire de France*, with additions from other sources. The work was published by Eld in a sumptuous folio of 1052 pages, followed by "a table of the most memorable things contained in this Historie," and adorned by woodcut portraits of the sixty-three kings of France, from Pharamond I to Henry IV. In the

¹ In the *Stationers' Registers* under date of September 20, there is the following entry: "Master Blounte Entred for his Copie vnder th[e] h[an]des of the Bishop of London and the wardens A remarkable and true historie of the siege of Ostend on eyther partie vntill this present Provided that there be nothinge in yt offensive to the church and state here . . . Vjd."—Arber's *Transcript*, Vol. III, p. 271.

² On the title-page of Grimeston's translation he is wrongly called I. Goulart.

³ It was evidently doubtful whether the publication of the work in English could be sanctioned, for in the *Stationers' Registers*, under date of February 5, 1606-7, there is entered to Elde "a booke called *Histoires Admirables et memorables de nostre Temps* to be translated into Englishe, Provided that when it is translated he get further auctoritie before yt be printed."

⁴ The work must, however, have been begun early in 1606, for under date of March 3, 1605-6, there is the entry in the *Stationers' Registers*: "George Eld entred for copie vnder th[e] h[an]des of my lordes Grace of Canterbury and the Wardens. A booke called *The French Inventory* . . . Vjd."—Arber's *Transcript*, Vol. III, p. 315.

Dedication Grimeston states that he has chosen to translate de Serres as

an Author, whom (aboue mine own particular knowledge of this subiect) I have heard universally esteemed, for the most faithful, and free from affection, that euer toucht at that Argument; able to teach the vnlearned, to delight the learned, and draw to him as many Commenders, as Readers. The Maiesty, Graces, and Strength of whose worke, if I in my traduction haue in any way vnsinewed or deformed, I confesse a sinne against his graue.

In his "Address to the Reader" he again emphasizes de Serres's impartiality, declaring him to be "as free from affection and passion as any one that ever treated of this subiect," and gives in fuller detail his motives for translating him: first, to free himself from "the imputation of Idlenesse," which seems to have been with him an ever-present anxiety; secondly, "to give some content vnto such as either by their trauell abroad, or by their industrie at home, haue not attained vnto the knowledge of the Tongue, to read it in the originall;" thirdly, to encourage a patriotic spirit among his countrymen, who, seeing "the sundry Battailles woon by our kings of England against the French, and the worthie exploits of the English during their warres with France may bee incited to the like resolutions vpon the like occasions." It is in his "Address to the Reader" also that Grimeston indicates that he is something more than a translator, that "to make the History perfect and to continue it vnto these times," he has added extracts from "Peter Mathew" and other writers, but not to such an extent as to mar the balance and proportion of the work.

Thus Grimeston here displays something of the selective quality of the true literary artist; his materials are cleverly dovetailed together with an eye to dramatic effect, and his style, though not specially distinguished or individual, is lucid and well sustained. The volume had a well-deserved success. Among those who read it were Henry, Prince of Wales, whose copy is now in the British Museum, and Chapman, who, as has been already said, drew from it materials for three of his plays. By 1611 the edition, as Grimeston expressly states, was all sold out, and the printer asked him to prepare a new one, "and to

continew the History vnto these Times; whereunto I was the more willingly drawne, for that I would not have any other to put his sickle into my harvest, or to finish that which I had begunne." In its new form, which has the altered title of *A Generall Historie of France*, the work was brought down to 1610, ending with the coronation of the youthful Lewis XIII, whose portrait is added to those of his predecessors. Grimeston also, as he says in his "Advertisement to the Reader," laid himself open to the charge of having "exceeded the Lawes of Translation," by using "two partes of Arithmetike, that is Addition and Substraction." On the one hand he has added to de Serres's succinct narrative of events

the reasons and circumstances of many things, which hee did but onely touch at, . . . chiefly,—in matters of State, as Treaties, Compositions and Capitulations; wherevnto I haue added the Articles that the Reader may not onelie see what things were done, but may also know the reasons, and vpon what grounds they were concluded.

Here speaks the voice of the philosophical historian, as contrasted with the mere annalist; and equally characteristic of a sound historical method is Grimeston's wise economy in omitting "all things that doe not concerne France, or the French, referring the Reader to the History of those countries where they were acted." To this rule he makes one characteristic exception:

True it is that in the reignes of Charles the eight, Lewis the twelfth, and Francis the second, you shalle finde much written of the warres of Italy, the which although they were acted vpon another theater yet were the French chiefe actors in those Tragedies. Neither could I well omit them without leaving an imputation of idlenesse vpon those generous Princes, who imploied a great part of their reignes in making warre there, for their pretentions to the Kingdome of Naples and the Dutchy of Milan.

Idleness was evidently Grimeston's *bête noire*, and he regarded it as a greater slur upon "generous princes" than bloodthirsty wars of ambition!

The work in its new form extended to 1419 pages, followed by an "Alphabetical Table containing the principall matters mentioned in this Historie," and was again "given a good applause." The second edition did not sell out as rapidly as the first, but by

1624 the "book-sellers shops" were "unfurnished." Then, as Grimeston relates in a new "Advertisement to the Reader,"

the Printer desiring to bring this History the third time to the Presse, importuned me to continue it to these later times, whervnto I did the more willingly yeeld, being loath that any one should undertake my taske whilst God giueth me health and ability.

The addition takes the form of a supplement of 335 pages, continuing the narrative till the peace of Montpellier in 1622. Neither de Serres nor Pierre Matthieu was any longer available as an authority, but Grimeston states that he has collected his material

out of the best Authors I could get . . . there is nothing of mine owne: I haue related euerything plainly and truly without any passion, for the which my Authors shall be my warrant.

We have the same zeal for the truth as before, and the same aversion to diffuseness, which has led to the curtailment of "Some Articles in Treaties and Edicts," though without injury to "the full sense," and the omission of points more proper to divinity than to history; "else the Volume would have been immense, chargeable to the Buyer, and no great benefit to the Reader." Grimeston concludes his advertisement by speaking of himself as "almost out-worne with age and continuall toyle for the publicke," and though his later life proves the phrase somewhat exaggerated, the seventeen years since his translation of de Serres had first been published, had indeed been full of many-sided activities.

The favorable reception of *The Inventorie* had led him, on its completion, to undertake another equally burdensome labor. This was a translation of J. F. Le Petit's *La grande Chronique ancienne et moderne de Hollande*. It was entered in the *Stationers' Register* on August 6, 1607 (Arber's *Transcript*, Vol. III, p. 357), but it was not published till 1608. Eld and Adam Islip were the joint printers of the folio, which was illustrated by woodcut portraits of the successive "earls" of Holland and other prominent personages. In his dedication of the work to Lords Salisbury and Suffolk, who had already stood sponsors for *The Inventorie*, he states that J. F. Petit, whom he has chiefly followed,

is "an Author yet liuing and residing in our London." In an epistle "to the Reader" he lays further stress upon this by asserting that, if Petit's preface fails to convince anyone of "the truth of the historie," "he himselfe is yet liuing here in London, and ready to satisfie any doubt that may arise." But Grimeston, *more suo*, "in order to make this historie more perfect, and to continue it" from 1600, where Petit's narrative ends, till 1608, had used "some other helpes." Chief among these he mentions Emanuel Demetrius, better known as Emanuel van Muerteren, a Flemish refugee, who had spent most of his life in London, and who had written a work upon the later history of his country, which appeared in Dutch, German, and Latin versions. Grimeston also acknowledges his obligations to "Monsieur Holtoman," a French gentleman who furnished him "with sundrie excellent discourses," and to Sir Peter Manwood, who had put at his service "some observations in written hand . . . gathered by Sir Roger Williams, when he first bore arms under Julian Romero, a Spaniard, in the great Commanders time." He has inserted these, he declares, "Knowing they will be a grace and beautie to the storie, and a benefit to the reader," and has thus "borrowed a little of the laws of translation." But in the bulk of the work he had been faithful to Petit, and this involved, in his opinion, an unfavorable contrast with the *Inventorie* of the previous year. He warns his readers not to expect

the succinct stile of Iohn de Serres, nor the fluent discourses of Peter Mathew, but (being written by a soldier, and, as he himself confesseth, in harsh vnpolished Wallon French) you will accept thereof in this course English habit, beeing bare, and without ornaments of Rhetorick, my chiefest care and studie hauing alwayes beene to inrich it with good matter, for their better instruction which are desirous to learne. I must confesse my stile is harsh and plaine, for so is my authors.

It is doubtful whether variations in Grimeston's style in translations from different originals are as obvious as he thought, but evidently he was not without feeling for the rhythm of good narrative prose, and was anxious to reproduce it on fit occasion.

Almost twenty years afterward, in 1627, a second edition of the *Historie of the Netherlands* was called for. Grimeston sup-

plied "sundrie necessarie observations omitted in the first Impression," especially relating to the exploits of the English troops in Flanders, though he could not give all the details that he wished.

I could neuer bee so happie, notwithstanding I had conference with some of the great Commanders and Captaines, and craued the assistance of their Writings and Observations in those warres, that I might doe them the honour due vnto their valour; but they had not obserued Cæsars rule, who fought by day, and writ in the night, as may well appeare by his memorable Commentaries.

Grimeston would also have liked, after his usual fashion, to continue the narrative up to the date of the reissue of the work, but, "the Printers hast preuenting" his desire, he had to leave this task to the hands of William Crosse, Master of Arts.

As "an Appendix to the History," to use his own words in the dedicatory letter to Sir Peter Manwood, Grimeston also published, in 1609, *The Low Country Commonwealth, Contayninge, An exact description of the Eight Vnited Provinces Now Made free*. This was a version of a sort of guide-book to the Netherlands by J. F. Le Petit, of which, however, the original has disappeared, and which is known to us only through the English translation. The introductory letter to Manwood is dated from Orleans, April 10, 1609, and as Grimeston speaks of having produced the work in "such houres, as I could well spare, from my more necessarie employments, since my coming into France," he had probably been sent across the Channel in some temporary diplomatic capacity. But he was soon to be permanently delivered from the idleness which was so repugnant to him. In the *Journal of the House of Commons*, Vol. I, p. 412, under date March 18, 1609-10, there is the entry: "Mr. Serjeant Wood died the last Night. This Morning Mr. Ed. Grimston sworn Serjeant to the King, and to attend in Parliament." Thus on the eve of the most exciting period in our parliamentary history the important office of sergeant-at-arms was bestowed on the worthy translator, and though on March 5, 1618, the reversion of the post was bestowed on John Hunt,¹ it will be seen that Grimeston continued in enjoyment of it up to the period of the Long Parliament.

¹ *State Papers Domestic*, 1611-18, p. 525.

Nearly all his publications after the date of his appointment bear his new dignity on the title-page, but it is absent in *The Generall Historie of Spaine*, translated from the French of L. de Mayerne Turquet, which was printed in folio by Islip and Eld in 1612. It was dedicated, like its predecessors, to the Earls of Salisbury and Suffolk, whose "favorable reception of my French and Netherland Histories hath added courage to my will to passe the Pyrennee Mountaines, and to take a suruey of this Historie of Spaine." In the address "to the Reader" Grimeston, as usual, adds interesting details. Having omitted in the second edition of de Serres's *History* "all matters acted by the Spaniards," he had promised within the yeare to publish this *Historie of Spaine*: wherein (notwithstanding my publique seruice and many other difficulties) I haue forced my selfe to keepe my word, and to giue you satisfaction, though it be with some preiudice to my health.

Mayerne Turquet's work, which traced the history of the Peninsula from legendary times till 1583, was a compilation from writings in various tongues. From 1580 onward Grimeston, as he tells us, did not follow him, for "I haue both inserted diuers things out of other Authors, whereof he makes no mention and haue related some more at large then he hath done." Moreover, he has added a continuation covering the events from 1583 till the summer of 1605, when the Earl of Nottingham, the lord high admiral, returned from an embassy to the Spanish coast. For this period Turquet was of no assistance, as what he had written on it remained in manuscript:

he hath finished the rest [i. e., after 1583] vnto these times. I my selfe haue seene it in his studie at Paris, but he hath not yet put it to the Presse, so as I haue been constrained to helpe my selfe out of the best that haue written of these later times, wherein I haue been assisted by some wortheie gentlemen in the relation of some great actions.

Here again, as in the preface to the second edition of the *History of the Netherlands*, we see Grimeston's praiseworthy anxiety to get hold, where possible, of first-hand evidence from actors in the events of which he speaks.

The same desire for "actuality" is illustrated in a minor publication of 1612, a translation of Pierre Matthieu's *Histoire de la*

Mort deplorable de Henri IIIII, Roi de France. In the dedicatory letter to "Viscont Cranborn," heir to the Earl of Salisbury, he says that, though many "Pamphlets and petty discourses" have already appeared concerning the French king's tragic fate, yet he has

thought it well to make accessible to the English nation this account by Henry's owne Historiographer, who attended on him daily to record both his words and Actions, and who both could and hath written many particularities vpon this Accident, which were vnknowne to others.

It is noticeable that a panegyric poem included in the original, "Les Trophees De La vertu et De La Fortune De Henry Le Grand," is Englished, not by Grimeston, but by Jos[hua] Syl[vester], the translator of du Bartas. The sergeant-at-arms evidently thought verse outside his sphere, though most of his dedications are in the floweriest vein of rhetoric.

Two years later appeared *The History of Lewis the Eleventh*, a rendering of another of P. Matthieu's works, which presents no feature of special interest. It was followed in 1615 by a work with the exceedingly comprehensive title of *The Estates, Empires & Principallities of the World*. This folio of 1234 pages was a translation of a French work published for the first time in 1614 at S. Omer, and ascribed on its title-page to *le Sieur D. V. T. Y. Gentilhomme ordinaire de la Chambre du Roy*. The four capital letters were a transparent covering for d'Avity, the name of a courtier who produced a number of works in prose and verse. Grimeston, however, was probably ignorant of his identity, for on the title-page of the English version it is merely said to be "translated out of French," and in the address "to the Reader" the author is not mentioned by name. However this may be, Grimeston and the printer, Adam Islip, must have gone to work extremely expeditiously, for the translation is entered on the *Stationers' Registers* as early as December 2, 1614. The work ranges in leisurely descriptive fashion over the world from "China to Peru," including the "estates" of such remarkable sovereigns as "the King of Brama or Pegu," "the great Mogor," and "the King of Monomotapa." Grimeston, as usual, was not content with the rôle of a simple translator:

I . . . have added . . . in diuers places, wheras by my owne search and studie I have found somethings (happily not seene by him) which might beautifie the worke . . . I have also in other places omitted some things wherein my Author had been abused by the relations of others.

Among the things omitted are the bulk of d'Avity's statements about the Reformation in Great Britain and Ireland, and the condition of the Roman Catholics under the first English Stuart king. On the other hand, the topographical description of Ireland is greatly enlarged, and in the account of the Spanish monarchy a curiously detailed list is added of the household expenses of the sovereign.

In the dedication of his work to Lord Suffolk Grimeston speaks of it as "the last labour of an old man," accomplished with difficulty "beyond the faculties of his weake bodie." As he lived at least twenty-five years later, his words must not be taken too literally; but, whether from failing health or pressure of public duties, Grimeston gave his busy pen a rest till 1621, when he published a translation of a moral handbook, *Tableau des Passions Humaines*, by the French Bishop Coeffeteau. More important, from our present point of view, than its contents is the fact that it contains a dedicatory letter to Buckingham, and a poem addressed to the translator by George Chapman. Grimeston approaches the favorite with the customary incense of adulation to "the most worthy to be most honored Lord," but he shows shrewd insight in offering to him, as one already furnished with "all outward honors," ample means "in this little Volume . . . to all outward addition and illustration." In the light of Buckingham's future career the following words have a ring of tragic irony:

All men floting on the high-going seas of Fortune if destitute of Pylots, Cables, and Anchors; and moued only with tumultuous and vnbounded errors, in vncertaine and dangerous courses; may for a time perhaps in safety and pleasure enioy, and extend them: But at length (as t'were suddainly raiisht by the neckes) they are driuen helplessly headlong on the more horrible ship-wrackes. Since then your Lordships disposition to all goodnesse is in nature most sweete, most flexible, vouchsafe care a little to artificiall and experimenc't advices, that may rectifie, accomplish and establish you in all the heights of your honors.

Why Chapman should have chosen to prefix an encomium to this modest undertaking of Grimeston's, rather than to one of his great historical folios, is hard to say. It would seem from the tone of the verses "to his long-lou'd and worthy friend . . . of his unwearied and honored labors" that both the translators had recently suffered from detractors of their work, and the poet urges his fellow-worker, to whom as dramatist he owed so much, not to weary in well-doing:

In short, All men that least deseruings haue,
Men of most merit euer most deprauē.
How ever (friend) tis in us must assure
Our outward Acts; and signe their passe secure.
Nor feare to find your Noble paines impeacht,
But write as long as *Foæ* or *Nowell* preacht;
For when all wizards haue their bolts let fly
There's no such prooue of worth, as *Industry*.

Chapman's exhortation was apparently not without effect, for two years later Grimeston put forth another folio of 867 pages, *The Imperiall History. From the first foundation of the Roman Mōarchy to this present tyme*. This work, however, as Grimeston frankly states in his dedicatory letter to Cranfield, the lord treasurer, was mainly the continuation of another man's labors. The history of the emperors, written in Spanish by Pedro Mexia, and published at Seville in 1546, and continued afterward in Italian by L. Dulce and G. Bardi, had been Englished in 1604 by W. Traheron, and printed by Matthew Lowndes. Probably at the request of Lowndes, who published the new volume, Grimeston now revised and enlarged Traheron's work. In the biographies from Julius Cæsar to Maximilian I he made only slight changes, but those of Charles V, Ferdinand I, and Maximilian II he "cast into new Mouldes," while those of Rudolph II (after 1602), Matthias, and Ferdinand II are from his own pen. Thus the narrative was brought down to 1622, the new matter being based, according to Grimeston, on "the most Authentickall and Impartial-reputed Authours now extant, together with the confident relations of such as have been eye-witnesses of some of the late Accidents."

Except for the additions, already spoken of, to the histories of France and the Netherlands, Grimeston produced nothing further till 1632, when he translated *L'Honnête Homme, ou l'art de plaire à la cour*, by Nicholas Furet. This manual of the whole duty of a courtier was published in duodecimo by G. Blount, and was appropriately dedicated by the translator to Richard Hubert, groom porter to the king. It was followed in 1634 by *The Counsellor of Estate*, a version of a handbook of political philosophy from the pen of Pierre de Bethune, a younger brother of the great Duc de Sully. In the same year appeared a more notable work, *The History of Polybius the Megalopolitan. The five first Bookes entire: with all the parcels of the Subsequent Bookes vnto the eighteenth according to the Greeke originall*. The "Greeke Originall" was not, however, the direct source of Grimeston's volume, which was a version of a French translation of Polybius by L. Maigret. The first edition of Maigret's work was published at Paris in 1552, but had contained only the first five books and the fragments of four others. Grimeston's rendering is of the second enlarged edition, which appeared at Lyons in 1558. And if his work cannot claim immediate classical inspiration, it has at least the distinction of being virtually the earliest version of Polybius in the English tongue. For though in 1568 Christopher Watson had issued a black-letter quarto purporting to contain *The Hystories of the most famous and worthy Cronographer Polybius*, he had only translated the first book, and had filled up the rest of the volume with "an Abstract of the life & worthy acts perpetrate by oure puissant Prince King Henry the fift"! In Grimeston's translation of Maigret's version the first five books, and the fragments of books VI-XVII, with some omissions, were made accessible to English readers. It was no small labor to be undertaken by a man of advanced years, but it was stimulated, like so much of his work, by the desire to spread the knowledge of authentic records, whether of the present or of the past. Polybius appealed to his sympathies as

one who in the opinion of most men of iudgment hath been held to be very sincere, and free from malice, affection or passion. And to iustifie

the Truth thereof he protests that he was present at many of the actions and received the rest from confident persons who were eye-witnesses.

In 1635, the year following the publication of *The Counsellor of Estate* and *The History of Polybius*, Grimeston brought his long labors as a translator to an end by issuing *The History of the Imperiall Estate of the Grand Seigneurs*, a version of a French work which had appeared in 1626. It contains a dedicatory epistle to the first Sir Harbottle Grimeston, in which the sergeant-at-arms speaks of himself as creeping into his grave, and bequeaths the work as a "Verball Legacie" to his nephew. To the cares of advancing age may have been added financial anxieties, for in an account of all fees granted by James I and Charles I, with the arrears due thereon, drawn up on November 3, 1635, Grimeston's salary is entered as £18. 5, and half a year's payment is stated to be in arrear.¹ Nevertheless, Grimeston survived to attend in his official capacity the ill-fated Short Parliament, and at least the opening sessions in November, 1640, of the Long Parliament. It would seem that John Hunt, though apparently appointed as an additional sergeant, had become indignant at waiting in vain for the particular office of which the reversion had been promised him in 1618, and some serious altercation must have taken place between him and Grimeston, for in the *Journal of the House of Commons*, Vol. II, p. 26, under date of November 11, 1640, there is the entry: "Referred to Mr. Speaker to end the Difference between Serjeant Grimston and Serjeant Hunt." This tantalizingly brief entry is the last allusion to Grimeston that I have been able to trace. But it well may be diligent research would fill up the meager outlines of his biography as at present known to us. The object of this paper will, however, have been attained if it goes some way to show that Edward Grimeston's services to his generation in the sphere of historical literature have not hitherto received the recognition that they deserve, and that, while Lord Berners and Sir Thomas North are held in grateful remembrance, his name should not be forgotten.

F. S. BOAS.

CRANFORD, BICKLEY, KENT.

¹ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)* for 1635, p. 461.



THE ORIGINS OF GERMAN MINNESANG

Thomas Carlyle was no believer in the Theory of Continuity as applied to literary expression. He did not believe that the mediæval lyric grew by a series of pendulum swings from a lower stage of verse, less native and less lyric. He denounced the Cabanis doctrine that poetry was a product of the smaller intestines "to be medically cultivated by the exhibition of castor-oil." Flat-footed he stood for the Theory of Inspiration and, after characterizing the Swabian period in a paragraph of singular beauty, he surprises us with the climactic phrase: "Suddenly, as at sunrise, the whole earth had grown vocal."¹

Now, perhaps it were wise to accept Carlyle's dictum—and so to bed. But unhappily the choice does not rest with us, for we have been beset round about with theories of extraneous origin for the Swabian efflorescence—the waste places of the earth have been searched that none might suspect minnesang to be a German matter. Jakob Grimm asked all but one hundred years ago: "Why must German poetry be made to sprout from a foreign seed, when it is so robust that it can have been fathered only by an indigenous unit?" And to this apparently rhetorical question much answer has been made.

For there is a mind so single to assuming an early Germanic home in the table-lands of Thibet, or in the arctic confines of upper Scandinavia, that it will never assent to the fertile plain of central Europe as the birthplace of the Teuton. The same mind is likewise so intent on seeking the source of any desirable thing in the forgotten corners of the world that it prefers to posit the Isle of Atlantis or Ultima Thule as the brooding-spot of early German love-song, rather than acknowledge it to be possibly rooted in south German soil. Thus the minnesinger has been made to steal his provision from many sources—he was ever influenced, it seems, from without rather than from within. We have theories of oriental influence through the convenient medium of the early

¹ Cf. *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* (1900), Vol. II, p. 275.

crusaders and of the haughty Saracen. The ingenuous German minstrel has also been thought to be much shaken by the Byzantine ceremonial and etiquette introduced by Theophania. Much impulse was given him, we are told, by the renaissance of classical antiquity which came in the tenth century. There are theories of Celtic influence, first through an early mingling of Celt and Teuton, later through French mediation. There are, as we should expect, theories of Provençal and French influence¹—and I have even heard of Slavic traces which darkly shade the writings of Kurenberg and Hausen. But this last thesis slumbers in an unpublished doctor's dissertation.

Let us follow for the moment the development of a typical attempt to prove extraneous motifs the prototypes of the themes of early German minnesang. Only thus can we know how captivating this sort of play is. Gaston Paris says that minnesang had its form and spirit from the French lyric,² and Jeanroy in his famous but misleading book would prove the dogma.³ To begin with, Jeanroy cites the interesting but unimportant fact⁴ that manuscripts of French lyrics precede by a few years those of their German congeners. This condition of affairs is made much of, and the main argument then proceeded to: The earliest German

¹ We may not stop at this time to dwell on the development of these hypotheses. The bibliography of the subject, which is a large one, is conveniently presented in Schönbach, *Die Anfänge des deutschen Minnesangs*, Graz, 1898.

² *La poésie du moyen âge* (1903), Vol. II, p. 41: "La magnifique littérature poétique de l'Allemagne, à la fin du xii^e et au commencement du xiii^e siècle, n'est que le reflet de la nôtre. Les Minnesinger ont transporté dans leur langue les formes et l'esprit de la poésie lyrique française."

³ *Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France au moyen âge* (1904), chap. iv, part 2, pp. 274 ff. Jeanroy is ignorant of the latest literature on his subject, "La poésie française en Allemagne." He writes of a recent statement of Scherer's, although it was made in 1884.

⁴ Is such a fact not unimportant? Or shall we make the bibliography of the lyric the biography of it? Here is a pretty case in point: Prior to the year 1896 the view maintained that a certain sort of popular German ballad arose during the fifteenth century. This view of course was based on manuscript tradition. In 1896 Schröder published in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (Vol. XVII, "Die Tänzer von Kolbigk") a stanza in Latin translation of just such a sort of popular German ballad from about the year 1013:

Equitabat Bovo per silvam frondosam,
Ducebat sibi Merswinden formosam.
Quid stamus? Cur non imus?

As it were, *Es reitet Bovo durch blättrigen Wald,—Begegnet ihm Merswind wohlgestalt*, etc. From 1896 on criticism may now establish the popular ballad (sung to the accompaniment of the dance) as one of the main roots of the lyric—the other two ascertainable roots, according to Kögel (*Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters*, Vol. I, part 2, 1897, p. 650), being the strophic epic and the Latin *vagantenlyrik*.

lyrics center about three motifs: (a) *separation*; (b) *absence*; (c) *reunion*. Now, these very themes Jeanroy discovers to be those of French lyrics which exist in slightly earlier texts. Therefore the *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, the *quod erat demonstrandum*: French lyrics are the source of German lyrics.

How futile such "proof"! What other motifs than the three of Jeanroy are found in simple, popular love-lyrics anywhere, let the initiated ask. Erotic popular verse which excludes reflection must needs content itself with (a) the presence of the loved one and the pertinent bodily charms; (b) sighs for the absent one's return and a sketching in of attendant loneliness, fear of unfaith, or fear of death; (c) the loved one's return, and the joys of surrender and possession. Particularly does naïve erotic song lend itself amiably to such treble classification, if one be as adaptable in applying captions as is Jeanroy. Let us take up our *Minnesangs Frühling* (edd. Lachmann-Haupt⁴, 1888) and turn to the anonymous pieces. *Dû bist mîn, ich bin dîn* goes into pigeonhole (c), *reunion*. *Waer diu werlt alliu mîn* falls gracefully into compartment (b), *absence*, etc. Not simple poetry alone, but all the facts of life and death as well, will yield to such quacksalvery.

Gawk-handed, however, as Jeanroy's attempt to find the source for German lyric outside of Germany may be—awkward and funny as other similar attempts have been—it is still to be preferred to the procedure of those scientists who have tried to build up a lyric from something other than a lyric. Lachmann used to teach that prior to the twelfth century Germans expressed their erotic impulses in narrative form, and today we are told that the lyric developed very slowly in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in part under the influence of the Latin goliard poetry, in part as an offshoot of the epic and the ballad.¹ We even learn of an undifferentiated poetry—whatever that may be.

Mr. Gummere, for example, presumes that poetry had to pass through ages of preparation, in order to create its communal elements. Circling in the common dance, moving and singing in the consent of common labor, the makers of earliest poetry, he

¹ Kögel and Bruckner, "Althoch- und Altniederdeutsche Literatur," *Pauls Grundriss* (1901), Vol. II, p. 33.

says, put into it the elements without which it could not thrive. Afterward—we are not told when—communal poetry brought forth individual poetry by a sort of fissiparous birth, and an asexual poet, who was every member of the throng in turn, detached himself. Later—the approximate date of this occurrence is not hinted at—this solitary artist came at last to independence by means of short improvisations; the communal fashion of poetry became a lost cause, the poet took the place of the choral throng, and his triumph was complete. *Das volk dichtete nicht mehr.*

For Mr. Gummere as a theorist on the origins of poetry there can be no censure. Such a picture of the coming-to-be of rhythmic utterance as he paints for us is as acceptable perhaps as any which the imagination can construct. It is at least conservative. Compared with the theorist on the origins of language who endows proethnic man with the power to achieve different words for things clearly and distinctively; compared with the syntactician who gives primitive human beings a feeling for the accusative case as typifying the direction toward which, or as typifying contact, there is an indwelling reasonableness in Mr. Gummere's premises. But there may be censure for those who believe that Mr. Gummere's artist had not detached himself from the throng so late as the first century of the Christian era; for those who read in the *Germania* of Tacitus that the poetry of Germans still consists of choral and communal song, and then maintain that lyric was not yet born; for those who read of this poetry of masses of men, of warriors moving into battle, of the tribe dancing at religious rites, and then assert with Lachmann that another thousand years would be required to bring forth the lyric.

Poor Tacitus! He told us only what he would, not what we wish he might have told. Conscious literature in the Roman provinces, he would have us know, consisted of choral song of epic-mythical content. And so it did. One does not tell history today in doggerel verses, nor did the German peoples spoken of by this tourist from the south; that sort of thing, if it be done in verse, requires the oratorio and the orotund. When Tacitus further says that these songs are the one way in which the Ger-

mans chronicle their history, he is thinking of the history of the clan, of the tribe, of its deeds and the deeds of its heroes. He is not dealing with that larger concept of history which a late age has read into it: the whole unvarnished story of the religion and customs of a people, their employment of the arts of peace, their relations with other peoples, their struggles for freedom of conscience and of intellect—*kulturgeschichte*. For the purpose of chronicling these matters no song of epic-mythical content, delivered to the great audience of the moot, sufficed.

But grant that the *Germania* is not an idyl after the manner of Voss's *Luise*; grant that it is neither a romance nor a political pamphlet, that its author had really left the walls of Rome before writing his book, and that the West Teutons along the Rhine were as he pictured them: a race *κατ'ἔξοκην*; drunken, but with a regard for the chastity of women which measured out death for the ravished vestal; primitive, but with a Chesterfieldian sense of honor. How does this affect that other part of the whole about which we should so gladly be enlightened? Was there no thud and beat of soldier song for weary German warriors? Did the drooping slaves toil on with never a plaint uplifted in drudgery? Was there no doggerel stanza for harvest festival, no boisterous pasquinade for nuptial rites, no dance couplet for flying feet, no swelling shout of lyric hymn in the mead-hall after victory was had? No low cadence to accompany the turn of millstone, no crooning chant for the restless child—no soul emptied forth in aught but the epic song of the clan? No lyric stanzas indissolubly connected with gesticulation, with the flourish of arms, with the swing and swaying of the body, with the stamping of feet? No lyric song rushed with blood, rising and falling with the color-pulse of emotional expression—a blurred cry the sole hiatus of it, an indrawn breath to mete its quantities? Tacitus said nothing of all this. Why should he?

As to the lyric in Germany, that is another story than Tacitus thought to tell his auditors. But suppose that the choral epic was the only form of song that came to conscious literary expression; suppose that all visible traces of popular lyric verse in later centuries were obliterated by the gathering despotism of the

church which antagonized the traditional blasphemies and obscenities of the people. The thing itself was surely not eliminated. For, as ever in our observation of the history of popular lyrical verse, under whatever climate or among whatever races, the moment that conditions unite to make possible the emergence of this people's poetry into public view and favor, that moment it appears full-born. In what nook or cranny of national consciousness it has lain hidden may not be determined, but it never fails to awake from its long winter sleep when the first breath of a new life is blown across it.

What then, it is pertinent to ask, may have been the nature of this submerged lyric, the popular forms of which continued in Germany throughout the obscure centuries prior to the budding and blossoming of minnesang? We shall come to this later, but first it is good to pause and take a view of the centuries with which we are to deal, to gain greater clarity for the coming discussion.¹

Once upon a time there was a period conveniently known to criticism as the Long Gothic Night. Man during these weary months and years was waiting, it seems, for Trissino's *Sofonisba*. Surely did Prometheus long for the coming of Hercules no more eagerly than did man for Trissino. Finally, however, it was determined that man need not wait for the birth of the adventi-

¹ It seems to me at least that this is necessary. Long before I had read the opening pages of Maitland's *The Dark Ages*³ (1890), or seen Ker's Introduction (*The Dark Ages*, 1904), a new vista had been opened to my astonished gaze with each new book which treated of early mediæval Europe. The theater was the same perhaps, but scenery and action shifted marvelously. Books which tossed me about like straw before a gusty wind were Ampère, *Histoire littéraire de la France avant Charlemagne*², 2 vols. (1867); Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, 2 vols. (1891); Soeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 2 vols. (1895-1901); Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century* (1901); Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*² (1899); Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought* (1884); Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great* (1877); Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (1903); Saintsbury, *A History of Criticism*, Vol. I (1900); Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo*², 2 vols. (1896); Hertz, *Spielmannsbuch*² (1900); Reich, *Der Mimus*, Vol. I (1903); Chambers, *Mediæval Stage*, 2 vols. (1903); and a dozen others scarcely less important. Even such encyclopædic collections as Ebert, *Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (1880-1889); Touffel-Schwabe, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*⁵ (1890); or Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*⁷, Vol. I (1904), were powerless to aid except in details; and the scores of monographs devoted to single authors or single periods had each a new viewpoint. Clear as some of these books are, powerful as a few of them may be, interesting as they seem almost without exception, they leave the reader who would gain insight into the times with which they deal in sad confusion of mind. He feels that he has endeavored to witness one well-constructed drama, and has been given a fortnight of vaudeville instead.

tious Italian, and his sentence was so shortened that he was considered free as early as 1100 A. D. The critic who had adjudged that "the years from 440 to 1440 were a Dark Period of Time" was thus put clearly in the wrong and told that William of Poitou was to serve as redeemer from darkness instead of Trissino. Thus the beginning of the twelfth century is made the dividing line between Dark Ages and Middle Ages.

If we were to reduce to words the mental picture which many of us have of the past, I imagine the following vision, or something like it, would be the result: Two great mountain-ranges confront one another, on the summits of either of which loom "far-shining cities and stately porticoes." One of these cloud-capped peaks is the Græco-Roman world, the other is the modern world. Half-way down the side of the former of these ranges are the dwellers of the Silver Age; half-way up the side of the latter range are the dwellers of the age of Renaissance. But uncounted fathoms beneath in the dank valley is the night of the Dark Ages, and there in the grim hollow of ignorance and superstition dwells pre-mediæval man.¹

Well, what's in a name? Sunday is no better a day, I presume, for being Sunday—certain old retainers to the contrary notwithstanding. A rose by another name would smell as sweet. A man's a man for a' that—and if you call him Jew or call him Cagot. So no objection should be raised maybe to classifying six hundred odd years as the Dark Ages, and four hundred more as Middle Ages, were it not for a single element of danger which clings to such nomenclature. This danger is that many people—among them some who are old enough to know better—think these years so called because they are dark, or because they are middle. And then the joke ceases. *Dark* are they in so far as our straining sight cannot effectually pierce them. *Middle* are they only because of the self-sufficiency which will insist that we are the end. Final we are to none but ourselves; assuredly not to such as come after us. And the world will emerge from any slight deluge which follows our passing more easily than it rose when the water subsided from under the Ark.

¹ Such a picture is presented in Morison, *The Service of Man* (1887), p. 177; quoted from Ker, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

The German child felt sure that the pig was called *schwein* because of its unclean habits; adults who pursue a similar untoward reasoning demand that the Dark Ages be dark. Freytag and Seeck, to name but two of the scores who have drawn for us vivid pictures of barbaric Germany, present telling scenes of leanness and famine, brute force and brutish instinct, in these times. Who doubts the particularistic accuracy of their knowledge of the sources? It is only in their final assembling of facts, in their grouping of figures, that they fail to impress us utterly. Our gaze, dissatisfied with the meager story of the picture, is ever hunting beyond and behind for trace of the fulness, of the ruddy color, which we feel to belong in some measure to any age.

Let us dwell for a moment on the cause of this dissatisfaction which we rightly feel. Seeck, for example, like any other student of times which are dead, gets his information from a treble source: (1) from MSS contemporary with the events they chronicle; (2) from MSS of later ages which rely partly on hearsay and rumor; (3) from books which interpret MSS and other books not accessible to him. Now from these sources he derives a certain sum total which he interprets in terms of his own preconceived judgment—and this judgment is necessarily largely affected for good or ill by the conventional attitude of his immediate environment. Add to this the fact that but a vanishingly small portion of the manuscripts of remote times is left us—escaped from fire and sword, neglect and jesuitry, mildew and the worm—and one must agree that the life and spirit—the very nature—of an age is hidden from us. Certain of the conventions which gripped man's life in the past we may clearly read in manuscripts; several of the outward semblances which masked his under-life show bright from chronicles and memoirs long gone. Ceremonial and clothes, the external trappings of soul and body, the furniture of existence, are ours perhaps for the asking. But life can be distilled from these by no known alchemy. For what of the spoken word and the pitch of it, the careless laugh and the cause of it, the dying melody and the infection of it, the sigh and the meaning of it? We do not know barbaric Germany; we shall not hear and see it in any revelation which this world will bring. The essence of it, the aroma

and surface-touch of it, are gone past recall; nothing is left of it but recorded facts which bear it the ratio that an incomplete and stumbling lexicon bears the speech of the present day.

In one way these are warmed-over commonplaces, and may be lightly dealt with. In another way they must be recited like a credo by many of us before we go to our business of studying olden times. Otherwise we fall into the error of those who hold ages deftly in their grasp while they sum these ages in a sentence. How neatly turned is the following paragraph—one of the sort to be met with so nearly anywhere:

Throughout the Middle Ages life was so hard to live that ornament was impossible. You cannot imagine a primitive Briton embellished with the manners of the macaronis. Even the savage who decorates his canoe or polishes his kava-bowl approaches nearer to delicacy than did our woaded, touzle-headed ancestor; etc., etc.¹

For just how many hundred years will Mr. Whibley have us believe our ancestor was "Then the monster, then the man | Tattoo'd or woaded, winter-clad in skins"? And how can this author assert that ornament was impossible when our ancestor took such pains with his woad? He may even have had a lyric or two, although he possessed not the throat of a troubadour or the manner of a macaroni—for Botocudo and Mincopy have lyrics as surely as they have kava-bowls.

Suppose the Dark Ages were dark. How dark were they? There is nothing whimsical about this query which Maitland² discusses with so much point. Let us adapt his figure: We who live in the twentieth century are within a room in which a rush-light is burning; contrasted with the brightness of this room, the outer world shows black, although it is filled with serviceable twilight. On the road without are the figures of past centuries; let us say the figures of the time of Tribal Migration. Do we open our casement and cry out to them, "Have a care, or you will break your shins!"? Yes, we are tempted to do this; for we of little light believe less light to be pitch-darkness. *Pechkohlrabenschwarz* is the background of thunder-cloud given five centuries of German life, that the epic giants of the *völkerwanderungen* may

¹ Charles Whibley, *The Pageantry of Life* (1900), p. 8.

² *The Dark Ages*, pp. 23 ff.

be properly foreshortened in the middle-distance; that the recrudescence of gray and gloomy ecclesiastical literature may be explained. There is nothing essentially dark about the life of these centuries, unless it be that we have read their story from a fairly large body of tedious churchly literature, and have imagined that existence under the conditions therein described must have been tolerably boresome. Should a certain sort of present-day missionary tract happen to be that one kind of reading-matter handed down to our epigonists, and should they interpret our life in terms of it, they might well consider themselves fortunate in not having fallen athwart an earlier age.

The sentimental figures which dominate the later popular German epics likewise aid in creating belief in darkened times. Mr. Francke draws us a grim picture of the migration period, and engenders within us a decided aversion to this time of gray and red: Alboin forcing upon his queen her father's skull as a drinking-cup; Rosamunde poisoning her paramour Helmichis, to satisfy her wanton desire for another; Sigibert murdered by the emissaries of his son Cloderic, who in turn is brained from behind with an ax by order of Clovis; the aged Brunhilde convicted of the murder of ten of her house, tortured for three days and torn asunder by wild horses. We seem to be listening to muffled tales of the House of Atreus when our ears are met by notes like these. And yet how changed is crime by advancing civilization? With the memory of fresh atrocities gleaned with each new day from the public prints, can dwellers in American cities assert honestly that much betterment has been had? A difference in method of the performance of crime between the seventh and the twentieth centuries may be noted—we scarcely use wild horses today, for example—but no difference in quality. And as to quantity, who can surely say that fewer crimes exist today? Ah, but the newspapers exaggerate! is the despairing protest. Yes, but then so did the minstrels who sang of the giants and the horrors of their day. And these minstrels were the newspapers of their time.¹

The antidote to Mr. Francke's picture, however, we have in

¹ Cf. Weinhold, *Die deutschen Frauen im Mittelalter*,² Vol. II, pp. 131 ff; Vogt, *Leben u. Dichten der deutschen Spielmänner* (1876), *passim*.

recorded literature of higher authority than attaches to any minstrel's roster. Cassiodorus tells us of Theoderic, the Italian prince, as he counsels with his chamberlain regarding measures to be taken with the harlots who ply their trade at the crowded entrance to circus and theater. Here are the half-mythical proportions of Theoderic shrunk; his beard, it is safe to say, is no longer touzled like that of Whibley's ancient Briton, but trained by a supple Roman barber; he turns maybe in leisure moments to Petronius Arbiter, as Napoleon did to the *Sorrows of Werther*—and there is no absurdity in the picture. We have merely had, like Mr. Francke, preconceived notions as to the Theoderic of conscious literature, and woe to him if he fall out of his rôle as an epic figure! His stance is with Sigfrid the Nibelung, with Etzel the Hun, and with that melancholy Hamlet of a Hagen von Tronje—with glooming Wate and with Hildebrand.

And oh, for the season's myth, with its creaking apparatus of spring-god and waberlohe, valkyrie and Walhalla! And oh, for every attempt to lead things mediæval and things new back to that reaction of man upon nature in the ultimate days of man's childhood! Mythological concepts have been so gaining ground of recent years that Haupt once prophesied no cock would crow, no goat send forth its natural odor, but that some follower of Jakob Grimm would convert them straightway into symbols of Teutonic deity—thirteenth-century redactions of animal fable and popular epic which revert directly to the beginning of things! What are these but no uncertain indications that we regard the Dark Ages as a dimly lighted nursery in which man spent his infancy, babbling and prattling naïvely as children will.

Who has not heard of the mediæval renaissance which Scherer erected of the dry bones of Notker, the *Waltharilied*, and Roswitha? This period of "bloom" Scherer gave two culminating points—800 A. D. and 1000 A. D. Let us regard such exercise of the imaginative faculty kindly; for did one cease attempting to rend the veil which shrouds the life of these centuries, all would remain in darkness. Let us patiently consider a theory of efflorescence built of such slender materials as these, even if it is amusing to witness the few known literary values shift rapidly

from one base to another, to form new combinations before each new theory of appreciation. Turn off the illumining light of fancy from the conscious literature of this time which has reached down to us, and the year 800 still belongs to the Dark Ages. Thumb the electric switch of this same illumining light, and 800 suddenly becomes Mediæval Renaissance Culminating Point Number One.

And yet I prefer Scherer's "restoration" to the proems of Ampère¹ and Bahr,² Ebert,³ Gröber,⁴ and Manitius,⁵ who would have us believe that lyric poetry was dead in the tenth century in Europe. Scherer reads between the lines and behind them; the others but strip the surface-peelings of meter and verbiage from the poets of five centuries, and say in their haste: Originality is dead. Scherer would reconstruct a Parthenon from a broken column and a bit of frieze; Traube the while suggests taking away from Alcuin a poem because *hiems* occurs within it as a dissyllable.⁶ Scholars are busy in forgetting that it is unsafe to reason from literature to life, except as one may choose the former for the simple sake of analogy. They suppose literature in some vague unexplained way to be an index to the social life of a time; this life is therefore read in terms of it; and then the literature in turn is interpreted in terms of the life which has thus curiously been discovered. Such a method of progression but describes a circle which brings us back to the original point of departure. After a few such peripheral tours all sense of direction and all direction of sense are lost.

Traube's exact historical method of narrow deduction from known facts is no safer than the inductive process by which Scherer builds up a forgotten age. Traube cannot see a lyric, unless he be shown one; Scherer knows that the requisite of lyric impulse and achievement exists in every environment—that it is as fixed as the stars. Like the stars, its glory may pale if the attention of man has been caught and held by a stronger light, but the impulse is ever there.

¹ *Op. cit.*

² *Die christlichen Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms* (1872).

³ *Op. cit.*

⁴ "Übersicht über die lateinische Literatur (550-1350)," *Gröbers Grundriss* (1902), Vol. II.

⁵ *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie* (1891).

⁶ *Karolingische Dichtungen* (1888), p. 76.

Let us apply the Scherer method to something. Let us see if we can make a fair case for the presence of profane lyric during a time which has handed down to us in lyric form only the church hymns. We are not to prove a point, remember. We are merely to try to make it as reasonable to believe there was a Latin profane lyric at a certain time, as to believe there was not one. Scholars have rummaged this certain time through, found no actual profane lyrics, and therefore said—*perhaps* rightly—that there were none. And now for the method:

We may read the presence of profane lyric from the church hymn, which would seem to furnish an analogy too undeniable to gainsay. From the fifth century on the fervor of man's love for his Maker shone forth in unquestioned beauty from the religious lyric. Would you deny that aspirations of sense less idealized in tone paralleled these? It was a real world that was abjured in poems which variously prayed for the advent of the Holy Spirit and the Day of Wrath—or a world of straw. If a real world, then it held fast in its grip the wit and beauty of passing generations, for it was hardly escaped by prayer and fasting; it was filled with allurements to the flesh, for even to the ascetic eye the devil appeared in very pleasing guise. Are these things historically documented? Yes. Where? In lyric hymnology. A rainy afternoon spent with a collection of early hymns will prove the statement. Did some literature record this profane poetry, even if such literature was transitory and fed everywhere to the flames by some ultimate Louis the Pious? Yes. For if profane lyric song was not feared by many a Notker, then verily was the snare of the fowler not set—then Christian hymnology is an anomaly. For it counseled perpetual flight from nothing when none pursued. Why deal with the world and the lusts thereof, as if expression of these had changed considerably within the last few hundred years? Why judge all the world in the fifth or in the tenth century by a literature which fled the world and looked upward instead of outward? A most apt illustration crowds to utterance:

I doubt if a sharper contrast exists anywhere along the road of man's mental progress from religious vegetation to absolute egoism than is met with in two records of the tenth century. The

first of these deals with the entries of a monk during a period of twenty-four years. They are four in number and follow:

- A. D. 914. The Saracens were driven from all Italy.
- 926. Radechis the lord-abbot died.
- 931. The altar of St. Benedict was refurnished.
- 938. The sun was hid from the third hour to the fifth almost. We saw the sun, but it had no strength either of splendor or of heat. We saw the sky, but its color was changed—it was all livid.

These are, so far as we know, the sole notations in the span of one man's whole youth and adolescence. How glazed the eye, how inert the spirit, which opened with slow stare to the upholstering of a shabby frontal piece, to the passing of a petty prelate, to a partial eclipse of the sun, and to emancipation from the pagan—as if these were the four terms in an arithmetical proportion which spelled all of life! Led by just such evidence of poverty of wit as this leaf from a monk's diary, the literary critic has spoken pityingly of the Dark Ages unpierced by other gleams than those reflected from the past evening of paganism, unlighted by even the faintest dawn of modern times.

But there are marsh lights playing fitfully across this supposed gloom of spirit and intellect; for another record of the same period is a beautiful and tender love-song. A lover in his rooms awaits the coming of a tardy mistress. He has prepared for her a spread of spices and wines like unto Porphyro's. A choir boy and a singing-girl are chanting sweet melodies to the music of lute and lyre, slaves are bearing brimming goblets of colored wine; the lover bursts forth with the impassioned prayer:

Then come now, sister of my heart,
That dearer than all others art,
Unto mine eyes thou shining sun,
Soul of my soul, thou only one!
I dwelt alone in the wild woods,
And loved all secret solitudes;
Oft would I fly from tumults far,
And shunned where crowds of people are.

O dearest, do not longer stay!
 Seek we to live and love today!¹

Now, who shall say whether the voice of the perfervid lover or that of the dullard monk utters the note of the tenth century? They are each of them but one note of it; the monkish voice the stronger perhaps, but the lover's voice by far less weak than is currently imagined. For there is every reason why monkish MSS have come down to us, and reasons just as near why tender love-songs, born of a moment's passion, past with the satiety which follows hard upon possession, spoken to an audience of one, should have been lost. What of the voices which have not penetrated to us from the tenth century, or of those which we have heard, but not as yet understood? Some one of the voices which swayed hearts as the wind sways the sea may never have reached us—and this may have been the living note of the century.

Poetry vanishes when the mood which gave it birth has fled; its form remains for the after-born to study and muse on, but its spirit is gone. Liquid fire it may be at utterance, cold marble it becomes under the petrefaction of time. The sunlight dwells within only as it dwells in the coal that is dug from the pit. We know that for some short centuries certain men trembled before the world to come; we do not know what other shudderings ran through their frame shaped like our own. How can we say that this was cold and corpse-like because our breath cannot infuse it with life? We know that window-glass was not to be had in the tenth century, that gunpowder was not in use; but we do not know that the same epoch was lacking in sensuous yearning for those essential beauties which so satisfy us.

Whatever our tenth-century love-song may be as regards structure, rhythm, and authorship, one thing it must be: it must be

¹ Cf. Haupt, *Exempla poesis mediæ ævi* (1834), p. 29; Du Ménil, *Poésies populaires latines du moyen âge* (1847), p. 196; Symonds, *Wine, Women and Song* (1884), p. 14.

Jam nunc veni, soror electa
 Et prae cunctis mihi dilecta,
 Lux meae clara pupillae,
 Parsque major animae meae.
 Ego fui solus in silva
 Et dilexi loca secreta;
 Frequenter effugi tumultum
 Et vitavi populum multum.
 Carissima, noli tardare;
 Studeamus nos nunc amare.

part of the very spirit of the time in which it was written, so far as the poet lived it out. Did he reflect the past? Not consciously at least, for he bolstered up his verse with no classical reminiscence or allusion. Did he reflect the future? Only in so far as he was made prophetic by the springtime of youth and love. Think of a literary criticism which feels that it must relegate poetry as impassioned as this to the past, or refer it to a later time than that in which it made its appearance. The critic does this, however, in order that the facts in the case may correspond with his previously conceived theory of the matter, whatever this may chance to be. Thus with *Lydia bella*, "which must have been writ later than the thirteenth century, because of its classical intensity of voluptuous passion":

Lydia bright, thou girl more white
Than the milk of morning new,
Or young lilies in the light!
Matched with thy rose-whiteness, hue
Of red rose or white rose pales,
And the polished ivory fails,
Ivory fails.¹

Thus again with the *Sævit auræ spiritus*, which on account of the glowing warmth of its coloring is thought unmediæval:

Flora with her brows of laughter,
Gazing on me, breathing bliss,
Draws my yearning spirit after,
Sucks my soul forth in a kiss.²

Thus with that pæan to victorious love *Quid plus? Collo virginis* which is thought "unmediæval in its phrasing, because it reminds on the one hand of Catullus, on the other of Poliziano":³

¹ Omitted from Du Ménil, *Poésies populaires latines antérieures au douzième siècle* (1843), "parceque rien n'indique qu'elle appartienne à la période dont nous publions les poésies." Reprinted from Gaudeamus² (1879), p. 96:

Lydia bella, puella candida,
Quæ bene superas lac et lilium
Albamque, simul rosam rubidam
Aut expolitum ebur indicum.

² *Carmina Burana* (ed. Schmeller 1847), p. 148; Wright, *Early Mysteries* (1844), p. 114:

Dum salutat me loquaci
Flora supercilio
Mente satis jam capaci
Gaudia concipio.

³ The sentence is quoted from Bartoli, *I Precursori del Rinascimento* (1877).

What more? Around the maiden's neck
 My arms I flung with yearning;
 Upon her lips I gave and took
 A thousand kisses burning.¹

Thus with the *Ludo cum Caecilia*, because it is difficult for the critic to believe that the "refinement, the subtlety, almost the perversity of feeling expressed in it" could be proper to a student of the twelfth century:

Sweet above all sweets that are
 'Tis to play with Phyllis;
 For her thoughts are white as snow,
 In her heart no ill is;
 And the kisses that she gives
 Sweeter are than lilies.²

These and many other songs criticism is determined to assign to as late a period as possible, because they are not compounded of the simples which it has for the recipe of mediæval literature. We are told that we may never more refer to the hymn in praise of Rome as a seventh-century production—it has already been brought by an industrious paleographer three centuries nearer to our own time. There remains but to declare it a forgery by Conrad Celtes or Macpherson.

O Rome illustrious, of the world emperess!
 Over all cities thou queen in thy goodliness!
 Red with the roseate blood of the martyrs, and
 White with the lilies of virgins at God's right hand!
 Welcome we sing to thee; ever we bring to thee
 Blessings, and pay to thee praise for eternity.³

¹ *Carm. Bur.*, p. 145:

Quid plus? Collo virginis
 Brachia jactavi.
 Mille dedi basia,
 Mille reportavi.

² *Carm. Bur.*, p. 151:

Ludo cum Caecilia,
 Nihil timeatis;
 Sum quasi custodia
 Fragilis aetatis,
 Ne marcescant lilia
 Suae castitatis.

³ First printed by Niebuhr in the *Rheinisches Museum*, Vol. III (1829), p. 7. This hymn was at thought anterior to the seventh century (Du Ménil, 1843, p. 239), but has recently been declared a much later production; cf. Traube, *O Roma Nobilis* (1891):

O Roma Nobilis, orbis et domina,
 Cunctarum urbium excellentissima,
 Roseo martyrum sanguine rubea,
 Albis et virginum liliis candida!
 Salutem dicimus tibi per omnia.
 Te benedicimus, salve per saecula.

Another thing than the foregoing poem which has been moved three centuries nearer us is that first known synodical decree against the *familia Goliae* which Père Labbé says is of the year 923,¹ but which Du Méril and others state half-heartedly must belong to the thirteenth century. If Labbé be right, the tenth century becomes in a flash a time, not only of sadly twisted and tortuous Latin prose, but a time when Latin popular lyrics, *cantica diabolica amatoria et turpia*, are in full sweep across Europe; a time when more than one poet might boast *perstrepuat modulis Gallia tota meis*. And why not? Because, as said above, the life of the tenth century has been read from a certain sort of literature, and all literature then interpreted in terms of the life thus deduced.

Small wonder, therefore, that we feel the Dark Ages dark! For so set are we in our view of twilight in northern Europe from fifth century to tenth that we can never agree to the existence of a whimsical Falstaff, an abbot of misrule, a bishop of Philistia, before the time of Walter Mapes and Philippe de Grève, Serlo of Wilton and Gautier de Châtillon. The idea that Goliath could have entered Europe in the ninth or tenth century, thus antedating Arnold's "philistine" by eight or nine hundred years, affects us unpleasantly. "But it is the bohemian and not the philistine who is Goliath!" we cry. "And that is the point of the story!" retorts the initiated. For the minstrel was quick to catch the slur pronounced upon him by the church and adopt it for his clan and ilk. If scriptural authority for this be necessary, said he, turn to the Gospel of Nicodemus where it may all be found. Others than the minstrel and since his day have gloried in an opprobrious epithet—*sans culotte* and Yankee among them; why not he? If the minstrel could quote scriptural authority for his *missa de potatoribus* and his *evangelium decium et lusorum*, if he had the pattern of hymns to the Virgin for his *Ave! color vini clari*, why must modern pedantry insist upon the derivation of *goliardus* from *gula*? Why must it contend with Giesebrecht²

¹ *Sacrosancta concilia*, Vol. IX (1671), col. 1677; Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova collectio* (1769-92), Vol. XVIII, p. 324, evidently ascribes the decree to Gautier of Sens, who died in 913. Cf. Chambers, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 61.

² "Die Vaganten oder Goliarden und ihre Lieder," two articles in the *Allgemeine Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft und Literatur* (1853), pp. 10-43, 344-82.

and Hubatsch' that the goliards were clerks and formed into a close guild? Why not frankly admit that they were none other than the buffoons and merry-andrews; that their poetry was in accord with the spirit of its time; that it was composed by clerks and monks, janglers and spielleute of every description—sung in the streets by the people as well as in the schools, the churches, and the courts? However far we go in our journeying, one thing seems sure: the early centuries before the Middle Ages bore within them many, if not all, of the germs of what in literature we call modernity of spirit.

For it is just in these centuries that we come upon a veritable *joie de vivre* which demands unnumbered mimes, *joculatores*, *saltatores*, *spielmänner* to satisfy its manifold craving for pomp and show and entertainment. The memory of the Roman theater (vaudeville and pantomime) was alive throughout the western cities of the world; the highroad swarmed at times with singers and performers on their way to festival, wedding, and fair. Song and dance, canvas and tinsel, puppet-show and horse-play, local gag and market-place obscenity—when did these lack? So far as we may judge from unavailing capitulary and synodical fulmination, they were rife enough in every century from the fifth to the tenth. There may have been no languid northern ladies to emulate the *précieuses ridicules* of Rome, to adopt the drawling and doddering speech which Jerome characterizes, to write lyric verses for the play-actors as the Roman ladies did. But, *mutatis mutandis*, there was folly afoot in the north as in the south; and not every German matron was content to be that ideal combination of *hausfrau* and prophetess of which history speaks so warmly. Nor is the matinee-girl a creation of modern conditions; for much of the danger of the mime, we are told in chronicles, lay in the seeds of lechery he sowed in immature minds during his travels.

It is true that in the last two paragraphs we have been speaking of lyrics and literature written largely in the Latin language. But let us beware of neglecting as distinctly German productions songs which were sung in Germany, even if their dress be Latin.²

¹ *Die lateinischen Vagantenlieder des Mittelalters* (1870).

² In another study, soon to be published, I shall show that Scherer's assertion that the Latin dress of a song obscures all traces of its origin is not true.

Why should they be less German than were the thirteenth-century *Carmina Burana*? The language of these is not the speech of Flaccus made boorish and degenerate by mangling and decay of time and culture; it is the breath of the poet's quivering nostrils. And the poet is German, as like as not. The Latin is his thief's cant, his beggar's whine, his provision against starving. He uses it for gain, as others of his clan—the janglers and the harlots—do their merchandise. But it is more than jargon—it is more than the vehicle of his longing for meat and drink and lust. His spirit moves in it to unutterable invective and satire; he feels in it. This German has made Latin his very own, has adapted it to his condition, to the measure of his time and its thought. *Linden* may be *tilia* and *nachtigall* be *philomela*; but these are not of Ovid, these are of the landscape about him. And Cecilia and Phyllis and Juliana—these are the buxom wenches of his travels; they are no lay figures from antique pastorals; and their homeliness shines through the drab and purple of their borrowed plumage as an Iphigenie of Weimar does through the gloss of her Greek costume borrowed and worn for but a night. *Verteufelt human* despite their momentary pose in art! And the nature-introductions? These are not the personification of the *vis naturae* which the Latin school poets used—confess them frankly German as they are.¹

¹ It is the insistence upon the Latin form of the *Carmina Burana* which causes the vexatious words of Saintsbury (*The Flourishing of Romance*, 1897, p. 6). They are, he thinks, inimitable stylistic exercises which owe their comedy to play upon words; to subtle adjustment of phrase and cadence; to graceless catachresis of solemn phrase and traditionally serious literature; to the innuendo, the nuance which they impart to dog-Latin. Now, who shall find in such words as these a fit describing of the satire, of the love for springtide and women which he remembers in early mediæval Latin lyrics? Who will be so blinded by the study of form as to regard as jocund "the concentrated scandal against a venerated sex of the *De conjugio non ducenda*"? A more patient insight will recognize the moral aim and the religious significance of this philippic. And yet such dubitable characterization of Latin lyrics would not be vexatious in that it voices the mistaken impression of a single essayist, but rather because it is met with so nearly everywhere. The goliard songs are clearly written for melodies, it is said, and some of them are very complicated in structure, suggesting part-songs and madrigals with curious interlacing of long and short lines, double and single rhymes, recurrent ritornelles, and so forth.

The impression left by such words is one of stilted complexity, whereas the opposite is more often true. Many of these texts have been maimed to fit them properly to music, but many more are of such simple tenor and directness that they charm by reason of their very ingenuousness. And music, other than mere droning *volksweise* or strophic *récitatif*, was ordinarily added after the text had been made. Sure proof of this we have in the case of many a mediæval Latin lyric; for we know that the amorous odes of Horace were fitted to hymn tunes, and that goliards composed erotic songs in the convenient mold of churchly

If the form of a poem be the main element from which to read the spirit which dominates the theme, what should we have done if the *Nibelungen* story existed for us only in the Latin dress that Pilgrim of Passau ordered made for it by some court tailor? Should we have discovered in this lost Latin epic all the Germanic life and soul which we conceive to animate the thirteenth-century German redaction? Scarcely. For does not Trench¹ at the very moment of naming the *Waltharius*, the *Reinhardus Vulpes*, and Fulbert's song of the nightingale speak of "that dreariest tenth century, that wastest place, of European literature and of the human mind"? Might we not rather draw the opposite conclusion? Might we not say that German epic and ballad, village-yarn and lyric, were set particularly fast in the minds of people when they shimmer everywhere through a literature written down in Latin and within the walls of a monastery? Do not the tales of the monk of St. Gall and *Ruodlieb*, the *Waltharilied* and the *Ecbasis Captivi*, Schröder's Latin dance-measure and Werner's spring-songs,² tell of German tale and lyric in these "wastest" times? Does the delectable pots-and-pans scene in Roswitha's *Dulcitius* remind the reader of Terence or of a *schwank*? And no stretch of the imagination is required to conceive such a theme as that of her twice-told harlot and hermit story existent in German minstrel repertory³ long before it entered the gates of Gandersheim.

Let us use *Ruodlieb* as a paradigm for study. We learn from it that Latin was the vehicle for any serious attempt at authorship in this wastest time; that a language modeled on Vergil and Prudentius had become flexible enough to describe the environing world of men and nature. It also makes manifest how deeply monastic philosophy penetrated literature and how people relied for truth upon maxim, the unnatural history of the *Physiologus*, and sheer rumor. These and other things this novel evidences

trope and motet. Thus, though music was often made a procrustean bed to which the text must fit, changing and twisting to suit the needs of the melody, the very same text in other versions which have not been re-edited for the sake of some pre-existent melody show clearly enough how simple the original structure of the poem was.

¹ *Sacred Latin Poetry*³ (1874), p. 47.

² *Germania*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 230.

³ In some such form as the story of the snow-child, or the tale of the Swabian who outwitted the king. For a sympathetic study of Roswitha's effort and environment cf. Winterfeld, "Hrotsvit's literarische Stellung," *Archiv f. d. Studium d. neueren Sprachen*, Vol. CXIV (1905), pp. 26 ff.

to the literary historian, and they have come to be part of the stock knowledge of every passing student. Measures and values to determine the condition of designedly artistic literature in tenth- and eleventh-century Germany have therefore been got from this source and other like springs of information, and consequent dicta have been formulated. These dicta quite unfailingly compare the sad condition of mediæval German literature in the tenth and eleventh centuries with the happy upswing of the two following centuries which culminated in Vogelweide, Eschenbach, Gottfried, Hartmann, and the rejuvenated *Eddatorso*. This process of evaluation is succinct, exact, and based upon warrantable fact.

It is a process, however, which eliminates, or at best subordinates, the popular background of *Ruodlieb*. And just this monkish novel, despite its unwieldy hexameters, despite the fine feathers of its contemporary erudition, bears no uncertain testimony that the gist of it, one might almost say all that is good of it, is derived from popular literature. The characterization of the actors in this mosaic romance may have been due, as so often stated, to the genius of its author; but is more likely to have existed in precedent generations of *märchen* and *schwänke*. And, what is more important, the spirit and color of some of it must have found expression in lyric form before it was made narrative.¹ This antecedent body of tales and lyrics finds better proof from *Ruodlieb* than does the first "classical period of heroic song and story" which Scherer assumes to be back of the *Hildebrandlied*. Now, neither of these two "periods" should be over-readily accepted even as working hypotheses perhaps, but they do both answer well to the truth that the germs of every renaissance² are found, not

¹ Some statement of this is made below.

² Why will we so persist in positing "periods" and "times of new birth" in our histories of literature? For is not the final test of any "renaissance" a numerical one after all? The great revival which took hold of Europe from the fifteenth century on is of supreme importance as a movement, I take it, not because it carried in its bosom all the treasures of the past and all the glories of the future, but rather because it was heard and shared so nearly by all men. The so-called Abortive Renaissance in the reign of Charles the Great was still-born in that it penetrated the hearts of so few men, rather than because it made literature the handmaid of theology. The merely numerical question as to how many men in Charles's realm participated in this "renaissance" is as instructive in its suggestiveness as the similar query concerning the number of children affected by the Slaughter of the Innocents. A vanishingly small group in either case—despite Scherer and Gustave Doré.

in the traditional elements of antiquity which conscious artists conventionally copy, but in the vernacular body of popular tradition which precedes such florescence, in the "humbler" literature which is part of the very spirit of the time itself. Thus when, as with *Ruodlieb* and with earlier Latin literature in Germany, criticism looks singly to the form and denies content and theme, the spirit of a time is sure to be misunderstood, in so far as it is reflected in story and lyric. There were, that is, in mediæval Latin literature no single elements calculated to produce so great a novel as *Ruodlieb*, such limpid lyrics as the *Carmina Burana*. The impulse which was life-giving came from the German spirit of the age that gave them birth. There was in Latin literature everywhere the frame, the form, the pliant meter, the ready rime; but for the cosmopolitan breath of them the awakening spirit of the tenth and twelfth centuries had no other model, no other point of departure, than in the natural, national basis beneath them.

Now, who would say that there was in the tenth century so perfect a body of lyric verse as there was in nineteenth-century Germany? None, I imagine. For Goethe and Uhland and Heine may be accounted masters of literary technique and artistic expression beyond any presumable tenth-century lyrist, just so surely as they surpass in these respects Reinmar, Walther, and Hausen. But, except for this matter of form, is there added excellence of treatment? Is there, as Ker asks, any sudden shock of transition in turning from Goethe, Hugo, or Tennyson to the twelfth-century rimes of Provence? Except purely as a matter of form, is the development of erotic passion arrested at certain stages in a nation's history, to overflow at other stages the edge of the brimming cup? Is the difference in art-expression, that is, a variation in underlying emotional capacity, or is it a variation in the use of terms?

If one might in a single graphic sentence describe the attitude which our minds ordinarily assume toward early German poetry, I imagine it would read much as follows: Rome had a great body of literature of much beauty; corruption from within and the barbarian from without destroyed it; for some centuries the primitive German hordes cared not for poetry other than for an epic song

of certain native attractiveness; gradually, however, cosmopolitanism set in, and all the forces of the new culture and of broadening life brought about the tardy bloom of lyric and drama.

Well, as a study of literary form apart from literary theme this sentence might stand perhaps, although I doubt if anything but the final polish of artificial poetry is brought by one people to another of a different clime and period. But as a study of theme such a sentence is vastly misleading. For we may classify the lyrics of Heine under Jeanroy's three captions as easily as we can those of any forgotten twelfth-century lyricist. Heine undoubtedly had at his disposal a conventional symbolism which his unknown predecessor lacked; he was heir to a thousand whimsicalities of expression unused by the earlier epoch, but the basic ingredients of the lyric of both artists were at hand. The sun which colors flowers colored youth more years ago than a thousand. Fragrance of flower and of youth found expression of some kind to stir contemporary sense. Uses of flower and youth are much the same in any age, except as under differing conventions they come to various art-expression.

In the human rutting-season, when Darwin's male called rhythmically to proethnic female, the form of the lyric was simpler than when æons later, under the formulæ of etiquette, of caste, and of religious strife, the sexes were segregated. But in the former time there was hindrance to natural selection, though not in the shape of a castle wall; there was coquetry, though not carried on with guitar and fan; there were lyric impulse and incoherence, though they did not find expression in the artificial senility of *minnedienst*.¹ And who shall say that this rutting-

¹Jespersen will not wait for Lyric until Language came. He assures us that men sang out their feelings before they were able to express their thoughts. He thinks of the first utterance of humankind as "something between the nightly love-lyrics of puss upon the tiles and the melodious love-songs of the nightingale." These words are unreasonable, contends many a critic of Jespersen's—at least they are undignified. Dignity! How art thou confounded with starchy stiffness of mien. Must we forever follow Whitney and Madvig, and picture primitive man as majestically poised, ponderous in manner like the modern scholar whose shoulders bend beneath their Atlas-load: the burden of the accumulated wisdom of the centuries! Instead of portraying to us before language an all-enveloping silence—a void of sound like unto the formless earth and the darkened deep of Genesis; instead of contending that man achieved language by hypodermically injecting thought-content into the phonetic result of muscular effort, Jespersen believes that language, like love, was born in the courting-days of mankind. Lad and lass vie with one another to attract the other sex; the source of speech lies, not in seriousness, but in merry play and in

season did not disappear uncounted thousands of years ago? Certainly not the anthropologist. To the best of our recorded knowledge, the Germans of the first century after Christ had a reverence for women which no modern time has exceeded. There was sufficient incentive for the poetical expression of sighing ardor in a law which regarded sin against chastity as unflinchingly as did the Mosaic code.

What form this expression took we do not know. It was not exposed by Tacitus. Perhaps it was not thought fit for serial publication in the *Germania* or the *Annales*. But because we do not find from this time conscious treatment of sighing ardor as literature, we need not necessarily suppose there was stint of it in the social life of the period. If the philologist may place an asterisk before a word which the eye of man has not seen, and denominate this word *urform*, *nicht belegt*, we may star a lyric or two now and then which the ear of man has not heard. Except for matters of pure externality, he who would deny the German of the "dark" ages a lyric must be prepared to carry the burden of proving his contention.

What may have been the nature of the submerged lyric, the popular forms of which continued in Germany throughout the obscure centuries prior to the final budding and blossoming of minnesang?

Early Latin, we know, possessed at least five distinguishable sorts of popular song: (1) rustic dance-measures sung and trodden after the labor of a day in the fields; (2) sailors' chanteys; (3) soldiers' marching-songs; (4) mendicant stanzas of the beggar soliciting alms; (5) fescennine verses for nuptial rites. Documentary evidence for all of these exists and—to be quite at peace with the literary critic—we shall rest content to pretend that no other kind of popular song whatsoever was ever sung in early Latin times than just those which have happened to come down to us in the above enumeration. The question of accent versus quantity

youthful hilarity. Everyone is singing his best and dancing his bravest to lure a pair of eyes. On the rim of the world life is green and gay. And if we are to believe certain theorists, and agree that several hundred thousand years later European life was all grim epic and nowise soft-lyric—why, then the world was dying of old age and rigor mortis was upon it. But tenth-century Germany was not primitive.

(rhythm versus meter) will be no bone of contention; the critic may continue undisturbed in his belief that it took several Christian centuries to effect the miracle of accentual utterance in singing Latin verses. It is enough for us to know that while Cicero was declaiming to partially interested benches in the senate, while Vergil was toiling at the funeral pyre of Dido with never a misplaced quantity, nightingales were singing in the Italian woods.

Now, the fescennine verses which pre-Christian Latin knew appear in European literature certainly as early as the eighth century; grossly obscene, doubtless, so that one may not deny the proud claim of their authors—*non es poeta, Priape, fascinosior nostro*; caustic rhymes, as different from the calm purity of narrative popular poetry as the sting of a bee is different from the song of a lark; but so clutching in their ribaldry that in later ages all the fulmination of church and state availed as nothing against them.

Every race possesses a popular literature whose spirit is a scurrilous wit;¹ the people's songs and tales are as racy as they are racial before they have been pruned by convention and prepared for parlor presentation. Such rank verbiage betokens a virility beyond that enjoyed by any form of polite or conscious literature. The one element in the age-long history of literature which has remained immutable amid all the eddying and shifting currents of change is this same scurrilous wit; this stinging, plaguing, tormenting, coarse-fibered wit; *facetiae, fabliaux, schwänke, schnurren, dorfgeschichten, jeux partis*—coherent and identical—unvarying in their grotesque situation-humor and caricature. Not necessarily sensual is this wit, but materialistic, viewing man frankly as an object among objects in the visible universe, as a product of nature like the plants and the animals. From the earliest *gestanzeln* and *winileod* of the Carolingian nunneries to the latest epigram of the Tyrolese peasant, there has been no permutation of it. If one but study the modern *schnaderhüpfel* under the guidance of Gustav Meyer or Schuchardt, one will find

¹ Cf. the writer's "Studies in Popular Poetry," pp. 14 f., *Decennial Publications*, Chicago, 1902.

close kinship between these vernacular reaping-couplets and the antithetic, often leprous, Latin *fescenninae*.

Satire and sarcasm of much thoroughness would seem a heritage of the German. In that *bagan* which was more than half the battle, in the *gabs* which filled the mouth to cracking—what have we in early popular balladry but the flash of these everywhere? What were the rhapsodical lyrics which adversaries threw into each other's teeth—when Hildebrand and Hadubrand faced each other—when Walther of Aquitaine snarled at Hagen—when the adulteress and the red-haired thief of *Ruodlieb* stood bare before the multitude at the scaffold's edge? Lost are these in lyric form, but they can be read, with no amazing cleverness to help one, from the narrative dress which clothes them. *Schimpflied* and *schlumperlied* can scarce have failed in ages of simple hate, boasting, and revenge; ages which were pervaded by drunkenness, and the custom of rapine and slavery; ages where impulse was father to the deed, with no obstacle to intervene. Lyric *pervigilia* there must have been during those most astounding festivals which filled the time from *polterabend* to *brautbett*. Narrative strophes may have sufficed for the village yarn of the sentimental middle-class mother who hears of the returning Ruodlieb from the boy in the tree; but there was lyric utterance of a kind back of the lost episode of the lady-of-the-garters who had been overgood to the clerk, back of the text which a most emancipated *fräulein* reads to the surprised nephew, back of the dying moan which the outraged husband makes to his young wife. And in times when deformity and disease were considered a scourge from heaven there were mocking-songs. Who would say that the mischievous spirit of such *spottlieder* so avoided the vocative case of address, so avoided the second-personal note of direct apostrophe, that the narrative third person of the preterit indicative was alone felt to answer?¹

And the mendicant songs. Gypsy and outlaw, mime and minstrel, bear-leader and itinerant peddler, clerk and quack, were each on his own pilgrimage bent. Every age has its freemasonry

¹ As in the mocking stanza on the jilting of Liubene's daughter, preserved to us in a ninth-century manuscript (cf. Müllenhoff u. Scherer, *Denkmäler*³ (1892), No. XXVIII^b); or the verse on the man from Chur (Kögel, *Littgesch.*, Vol. I, part 2, p. 165).

of wayfarers; and every age which has given us record of such has left us many a whining stanza to elicit pity and alms. When monastery furnished asylum to these creatures of circumstance, the labors of the quiet monk who bent above the unfinished initial were often interrupted by scurvy chants of drinking which parodied Bible and hymn. In earlier times, when the sky was the only roof for the heads of *schirmaer*, *gigaer*, *goukelaere*, and *schuolaere*—before the adoration of the Virgin had given the model for *potatoria*, the New Testament evangels for *lusoria*, and scarce-remembered lines from Ovid and Flaccus the very mold for *amatoria*—the scene rang with vagabond lyric; unless—with the literary critic—we would deny the solace of song to an age which needed it sorely in the open and at the chimney breast, merely because the only tones which have reached us in the conscious literature of the educated classes of these times are those of harp and organ.

Körting finds in the national character of the German a mingling of contrasting elements: a masculine fierceness and coarseness adjoined to a certain emotional susceptibility, a dreamy melancholy quite feminine in tone. These contrasts are manifest in Anglosaxon poetry. The clash of swords and the rattle of mail sound forth in *Beowulf*, in the *Fight at Finnsburg*, in *Byrhtnoth's Death* and other epic pieces. But side by side with these is the elegiac sentimentality of such poems as the *Ruin*, the *Wife's Complaint*, the *Husband's Message* and the *Complaint of Deor*. If it be unwise to advert to them as distinctly lyric pieces because of their verse-structure and mannerism of diction, it is still permissible to say that these four compositions show clearly enough what the character of a real body of early Germanic song was like. Lyric song, too, which may equally as well have been taken across the English Channel from an original continental home, as any *materia epica* found in *Beowulf* or the *Fight at Finnsburg*. But it is only the absence of such lyrical pieces in any known German manuscript which leads the historian to assert that a national literature began to develop in Germany much later than in Britain. And despite this lack it would seem that the testimony of the *Hildebrandslied* was enough to convince

him that an abundant and early folk-poetry existed in Germany, one which need not have been exclusively heroic and epic in tone. A like message may be read regarding Francia from the song which celebrates the victory of Chlotar over the Saxons in the year 620, and which the women still used in the ninth century as a dance-song, or from the presumable historical ballad which deals with Childebert's campaign against Saragossa in 542.¹ For, did we possess no other mention of Anglosaxon lyrics, we might yet read of their presence in the *Wanderer* or the *Seafarer*. And when we meet in the *Hildebrandslied* no small degree of æsthetic maturity how shall we believe that the artist ever found his appeal alone in the form of the heroic epic, rather than in the mold of lyric elegy?

Are these lyrics of one sort and another, which we have just been discussing, German in form or Latin? Sometimes the one without doubt, sometimes the other, and not improbably on occasion that strange *doppelbräu* of "lustic Tintsch und schoen Lattin als ein frischen brunnen und starken win gemischet," of which Trimberg speaks. Controversy as to whether these lyrics did or did not exist before the eighth or ninth century in Germany is of small avail, for neither side of the contention can be definitely proven, if manuscript tradition be relied upon.² Simply because the manuscripts do not exist, so far as we now know. But personally I doubt if I shall ever be convinced that the German lyric, such as we have almost continuously known for eight centuries or more, was non-existent before say the year 1150, being discovered between night and morning of some individual day. Nor shall I believe it imitated from a foreign source in any of its essential phases. Nor shall I deem it a thing consciously evolved.

¹ Cf. Lenormant, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, I, 1, p. 321.

² We have likewise no French manuscripts prior to the twelfth century which contain lyric songs. And yet who can read without feeling their inherent truth Gaston Paris's remarks about the lyric of the Merovingian Epoch (486-751 A. D.): "Various evidence shows us that at the festivals the youth of both sexes danced to the sound of songs which the Councils condemned as immodest, and which were merely love-songs; that the repasts where the Romanised Germans gave themselves up for entire nights to their hereditary vice, drink, were enlivened by songs; that satirical songs were composed which the authorities were compelled to forbid. This shows us that popular poetry was abundant."—*Mediaeval French Literature*, p. 17. Cf. also Du Ménil (1847), pp. 189 ff.; Gröber, *Zur Volkskunde aus Concilbeschlüssen* (1893); Maassen, *Concilia aevi Merovingici* (1893); Gröbers, *Grundriss*, Vol. II (1902), p. 444.

Its origin seems no mystery, nor are its functions wrapped in impenetrable darkness, unless we make the lyricity of any century depend for good or ill on a single statement of manuscript. It is through such literality of labor that our time has suffered in its conception of Dark Age and Middle Age, quite as much as through what criticism often regards as the extravagant and fantastic claims of Jakob Grimm, Müllenhoff, Lachmann, and Scherer.

Where is the light? Is it in allowing nothing to any time long gone which is not recorded in discovered hieroglyph? Shall we deny to Babylonian culture some one of the world's ingredients for pain and pleasure because of tablets yet undug? Is it in so emphasizing one message of a people to posterity that all other messages are neglected? This is but to deepen the mire of traditional belief until it amounts to superstition; as we are discovering is the case with Greek civilization which we have accounted so "classical" in its teaching that all its romanticism has been forgot. Is there no argument possible from the point of view of common humanity, which shows much the same in any age; or shall the only testimony accepted by the court be that of circumstantial evidence?

These questions as to the life and literature of past ages cannot be solved. But surely, so long as the field of our immediate investigation be the lyric or drama, we must accept much on the purely emotional grounds of kinship of race and experience; for we can never study distant times from deposits and strata; we cannot reconstruct fossil growths from bone-vertebræ; we cannot apply the researches of Darwin or Spencer or Haeckel to the organic study of the common basis of literature, as if this were an accretion of protoplasm.

Is this not universally done? I have in mind, as a striking instance in point, a brilliant study in cross-section of the tenth and eleventh centuries in Italy. There is the life of the clergy spread out before you, as an anatomical wall-map is unrolled before the astonished eyes of the schoolboy. It makes brilliant reading, that part of the book which seems like a blood-stained chronicle of the crime of old Newgate. Some of it is dull work—particularly the section which deals with simony and church

disorganization. But the chapter on poetry is a wonderful instance of how much may be left unsaid. Poetry—we are told therein—was in these centuries nothing but grammar and rhetoric. Concise at least is this information; would that many a chapter of teaching were as succinct! But is the author right? Is it true that one might have walked the length of Italy during two centuries and never heard a happy lyric song? When one remembers that the Greenlander has poetry full of lyric sweep and love for nature, when one knows that even the Andaman Islander is inclined to lyric expression, what unerring testimony may our author have possessed, to pronounce so cathedral a statement? The source of his learning is discoverable: it lies in a collection of book-titles known as the "bibliography" of the subject. And the biography of the subject is to be taken from this? What superstitious reverence for books has fastened its tentacles on this enlightened age?

With this failure fresh in mind, would it seem worth while to collect further evidences from conscious literature of the presence of the lyric in pre-mediæval Germany? Would it repay the effort if we exhumed stray lyric bits here and there, treated them with formalin to repair their freshness and exposed them as added proof? I doubt it. And yet there is Fridugisus's farewell to his cell, with its insistent note of pathos, its elegiac beauty, no matter if it be distorted by an occasional commonplace orthodoxy and the poor masque of attempted classicality. And there is Strabo's love-letter, as tender and pure as a quatrain of Eichen-dorff's. Again and again we are struck by the color and life of stanzas and couplets from the poetic letters of the Carolingian poets and their successors. Buried they often are amid endless chaff, but even a careless search through the convenient material will lead the student to acknowledge that pedantry, imitation, stiffness of borrowed quantitative structure, canting godward—naught can quite obliterate even in such artificial pieces the vista of real poetry that stretches out behind them. And if a love for nature penetrated into this machine-made versification, if sunlight and beauty gleam through rifts in the shade cast by conventional piety and pose, shall we believe that the unseen and unheard

world of laymen found no expression for the passionate unrest which animates ever the human breast?

To me I confess the suggestion carried by the ballad measure *Equitabat Bovo* is as wide and conclusive as any gained from the most extensive of epics—where light and lyric lilt are in question. The mere remnant of *Hirsch und Hinde* tells its own story quite as effectively as a capitulary against face-powder and love-songs, were the latter a thousand lines in length. The popular strophic structure of the *Samariterin*, the *De Heinricho*, and the *Ludwigslied* bespeaks an environment of song and swaying rhythm by the cool well under the village lindens. The verses which Notker used as paradigms in his rhetoric are the despised utterances of the people which live in any age. The erased love-song in the Cambridge manuscript is a single nugget which draws the gaze of the prospector to a soil which hides a mine of unearthed gold.¹ What are these and other like hints to mean for us but that the lyric choir invisible is singing? Why ask for more than a single yellow gleam from the parted thunder-cloud to tell us that the sun is shining above it, that past warmth and future glory are promised by it as fully as by the blaze and glare of torrid noonday? And even if no single gleam appears and the whole sky is gray, does not the memory of other days and other times inform us that the sun is there, albeit shrouded from our human gaze?

Which shall we subscribe to—this doctrine of an ever-present inspiration, or that other orthodoxy of continuity which ever derives one thing from another? Theory of Continuity—what sins have been committed in thy name! By what insensible gradations has the lyric had to grow! Tirelessly and from lower organisms must we trace its development. Impulse—other than the unexplained initial impulse—there has been none. Inspiration—other than that first breath of God or chance—has been impotent to alter by jot or by tittle the unnumbered accretions

¹Scherer long ago directed attention to the beautiful *Verna feminae suspiria*, an example of pathetic fallacy which seems remarkable because of the early date of its composition (end of tenth century). Cf. Scherer, *Geschichte d. deutschen Dichtung im XI. u. XII. Jahrhundert* (1875), p. 8; Jaffé, "Die Cambridger Lieder," *Z. f. d. Alt.*, Vol. XIV (1869), p. 492; Winterfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

by which lyric has come to be. (And Adam begat Seth; and Seth begat Enosh; and Enosh begat Kenan.) Inherent need for utterance, recurrent power of full expression in personality, emergency of life—these have availed as naught against the insensate ongoing of plantlike growth which finally yields the lyric.

Let us see how current doctrine as to the genealogical tree of lyric expression sounds. Here it is: Scôp and minstrel, troubadour and spielmann, sit with their elders in the seats of the mighty and sing full-throated to them as they eat. Not that the player actually invented his songs; he ever took his themes from somewhere else; he had ever been anticipated. Creation, it seems, was not of him, for men of a southern clime had grown up faster than had he, and they had stolen all his thunder. His very rhythms he had to get as best he could from other rhythms, and he lacked the consolation of knowing that these in their turn had been taken from things that look like rhythms but are not—things which we call meters. Verses these meters are which hang suspended and without stress on the lips of their awe-struck utterers. But though he could not create a lyric, the minstrel could graft one—and this afforded him some solace. So he sings care-free to his pleased auditors, and they pat him kindly on the shoulder and make him presents: a side of beef, a fur-tipped mantle somewhat out of fashion, or a foaming mug of ale.

His song he stole from the church. Now, it seems that the clerks coming out of the portal after a two-hour session with the liturgy drank deep draughts of the clear, sun-lit air and warbled the final vowel of the *alleluia-a-a-a*, till one would think they were never going to stop. Thereafter certain pious brethren reduced these warblings to many different set schemes, until there came to be such a deal of them that none could retain them all without confusion. Years passed, but the knotty problem of mnemonic device remained. One day toward twilight a monk from the razed cloister of Jumièges toiled up to the gate of St. Gall with an antiphonary under his arm; and this book contained a syllable for every neume. On that evening this messiah of coherency freed the spirit of the mediæval lyric, for the men at

St. Gall now had sense to proceed with the erection of their musical sequences so that the clerks might retain them. And the lyric bloomed henceforth.

His rimes the minstrel got from a parent, who had in his turn derived them from certain homespun utterances of uneducated Romans known as popular songs. These Latin rimes too grew, curiously enough, quite by chance—like later *Topsies*; for they could not help growing in a highly inflected language. If the minstrel had had them to create all out of nothing, he might well have failed; but happily he had nothing to do but just sit by until the things evolved themselves. Not that rime came first in full shape—otherwise it might have descended overheavily upon the unready minstrel—but little by little. First the minstrel must be content with the homeopathic assonance; only he must be careful not to speak the ultimate consonants with much distinctness for some while, or he would rime before he was expecting it. The Latin inflection which saved the world from a sahara of blank verse may now be taken up and developed from something else, either from kindly Olympus or from a primordial cell.

Such is the Theory of Continuity as applied to the lyric. Its evident weakness lies in the fact that it presumes fifth- and tenth-century German to be as inefficient as a child, as groping as the untutored savage. Let us believe it not. For we know that he who would seek the remains of primitive man must hunt him in kitchen-midden and in barrow; in burial mound and beneath the lava beds and sands of the south. If the student thinks to find him where many a literary critic is searching—in fifth- and tenth-century Europe—he must not look outside of manuscript tradition; he must continue study of books alone. Let the student not confuse Literature with Life. For with literature as with men the good die young. Those whom the gods love they often refuse to share with posterity.

PHILIP S. ALLEN.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

STUDIES IN THE TEXTUAL INTERPRETATION OF "BEOWULF"¹

D. NOTES ON VARIOUS PASSAGES²

12. *ðæm eafera was æfter cenned.* *æfter* is not exactly "afterward," "later," as it is commonly understood; it denotes rather "coming after him," as in l. 2730: *þær me gifede swa | ænig yrfeweard æfter wurde.* Cf. *ær* in l. 1356.

20-25. *swa* refers back to something that has been told before (see e. g., ll. 99, 144, 189, 559, 1046, *swa sceal* . . . ll. 1172, 1534, 2166); it is not the direct antecedent of *þæt* (l. 22); *gewyrcean* is not "work," "act," but (perfective) "bring about," like *gefremman* (l. 954). "In such a way as he (i. e., Scyld, not Beowulf) did, a [young or, according to Grein 1, prudent] man ought to bring it about by liberality in his father's house that his comrades will stay by him later on in times of war." Sievers,³ who has admirably elucidated the entire Introduction, still questions whether there may not be a gap between ll. 19 and 20. I prefer his other alternative that something has been left "unausgedrückt," something, that is, which did not need to be expressed, since it is implied in a previous statement. For how could the king have been so successful in war, had he not been conspicuous for generosity, which gained for him the loyalty of his followers? These two ideas were inseparably connected in the minds of the ancient Teutons.

The style of this archaic portion is decidedly abrupt, but the sequence of thought in the first half of the Introduction is clear. "Scyld was a glorious king; he conquered many tribes; he was

¹ See *Modern Philology*, III, 235-65.

² Only a few bibliographical references have to be explained. Bugge = *Beiträge*, XII, 79-112, 366-75; Cosijn = *Aanteekeningen op den Beowulf*; Holthausen = *Anglia-Beiblatt*, X, 265-74; Kock = *Anglia*, XXVII, 218-57; Müllenhoff = *Beowulf*, 1889 (in part = *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, XIV, 193-244); Riiger = *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, III, 381-416; Trautmann = *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, II, 121-92. As this paper was completed in the spring of 1904, references to Sievers' article "Zum Beowulf" in *Beiträge*, XXIX, 305-31, have been appended afterward in brackets. To Grundtvig's edition I have had no direct access.

³ *Beowulf und Sazo*.

blessed with a son, who gives promise of a continuation of dynastic splendor. Lo, here is a model of a ruler!"

28-31. *hi hýne þa ætbæron to brimes farode, | swæse gesiþas, swa he selfa bæd, | þenden wordum weold wine Scyldinga,— | leof landfruma lange ahte.* The result of the numerous interpretational attacks upon ll. 30 and 31 has not been quite satisfactory, because their connection with the preceding lines has not been sufficiently considered, and because (by certain scholars) the parallelism of ll. 30 and 31 has been taken for granted too easily.

Scyld's men prepare the funeral of their beloved king, as he had bidden them while he "wielded his words" (not "ruled with words"—Garnett, Kemble, Thorpe, Cl. Hall, Tinker, Trautmann). Similarly Beowulf gives directions concerning his own funeral honors (ll. 2802 ff.), and his mourning thanes carry them out—*swa he bena wæs* (l. 3140).¹ "Daaraan werd vastgeknoopt de mededeeling, dat die regeering langen tijd geduurd heeft" (Cosijn). In other words, l. 31, added paratactically, conveys the very appropriate idea: "his had been a long (and beneficent) reign." (Cf. *Helgakv. Hund.*, 1, 10: *oc hann harðan let | Hunding veginn, þann er lengi rep | lóndom oc þegnom*). The implied object of *ahte* is *hi* (it need not be expressed; cf. l. 2208); cf. *þær he folc ahte, | burg ond beagas* (l. 522); *ic þas leode heold | fiftig wintra* (ll. 2732, 911, 2751); *folcagende* (see Grein). I admit the possibility of construing *leof landfruma* as variation of *wine Scyldinga*, which would entail a change of punctuation in accordance with Grein.²

To the list of previous explanations summarized by Kock, Bright's emendation³ should be added: *þenden wordum geweald wine Scyldinga, | leof landfruma, lange ahte.* It is more attractive than any of the seven other emendations, but the combination *wordum geweald ahte* does not sound quite genuine, and *lange* does not at all harmonize with its surroundings. Cosijn's attempt to justify the collocation of *þenden* and *lange* by a reference to ll. 57 f. *heold þenden lifde, | gamol ond gudreoww,*

¹ Cf. *Atlamd.*, 102 ff.; *Völunga Saga*, ch. 31.

² *lange ahte* might be compared with *mihtig hæfde*, (*Par.*) *Ps.*, LXXVII, 60, 3b.

³ *Modern Language Notes*, X, 43.

glæde Scyldingas, must be considered inadequate; for, though Healfdene was of course not all his life *gamol*, he lived in the memory of the people as an aged ruler, just as *der alte Fritz*.

The ninth emendation, fathered by Kock, *lan geahte*, ingenious as it is, rests on several mere assumptions. The existence of *OE. lan* and the signification claimed for it in this place, are open to doubt, and the only passage in which *geagan* has been found (*Ælfr., Hom., 1, 64*) is in favor of the ingressive meaning, "obtain." Cf. Goth. *gahaban, Mc., 3, 21; 6, 17.*¹

62. Kluge's emendation,² *hyrde ic, þæt Sigeneow wæs Sæwelan cwen*, has been adopted not only by Holder, 2, but also by Socin, 7. It should be noted by the way, that, according to Bugge,³ *Seafela* would be the proper OE. form, answering to the ON. *Sævil*. I confess that it seems safer to me, in view of the designation *Heaðoscilfing*, to stick to Grundtvig-Bugge's *Onelan*, and admit ignorance as to the name of Healfdene's daughter. The only excuse for Trautmann's *ond Yrde ec*⁴ is readily disposed of by a consideration of the proper stylistic function of *hyrde ic* (epic formula of transition, cf. l. 2163), as I have pointed out in *Modern Philology*, III, 243.

72f. By a hairsplitting process, Trautmann arrives at a translation which has no advantage over the usual explanation, and which is highly improbable; for *swylc him God sealde* is a complete phrase and should not be expanded. *folcscaru* seems, indeed, in this place to denote "land;"⁵ cf. *B., 2321, landwara*.

76. *him on fyrste gelomp | ædre mid yldum*. Earle's rendering, "with a quickness surprising to men," together with his labored explanation (cf. also Cl. Hall, "quickly, by mortals' reckoning"), disregards the formula-like character of *mid yldum*. Anything might be said to exist or occur *mid eldum*; cf. l. 2611; *Wald., 1, 11; Gen., 2286; Riddl., 6, 6; mid mannun* (see Grein); OS. *mid eldiun, mid mannun, mid frihun; B., 944, æfter gum-*

¹[After writing this note, Sievers' article in *Beitr., XXIX, 305 ff.*, has come to hand. No change has been made in my text.]

²*Englische Studien, XXII, 144 f.*; but see also Grein, *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur, IV, 285; Kemble, ii, XXXIX; Leo, p. 17.*

³*The Home of the Eddic Poems, 177.*

⁴*Anglia-Beiblatt, X, 261.*

⁵Cf. *Anglia, XXV, 275.*

cynnum. To say that the phrase has no definite meaning would be just a little too severe on the above passage.

104 ff. The passage which introduces Grendel and tells of his descent from Cain is one of the most confidently condemned portions of the poem. In recent times, Professor F. A. Blackburn, in his careful study of "The Christian Coloring in the *Beowulf*,"¹ has postulated for it an original part and an interpolation, making the point that it "offers serious difficulties of interpretation and confusion of thought to a much greater degree than we should expect, even in Old English poetry." Still it seems to me that there is no more than a permissible amount of forward and backward and sideward movement of the narrative; see, e. g., the account of Grendel's visit in ll. 702 ff., which is, indeed, somewhat less complicated, since there was no need to allude to the origin and dwelling-place of the monster. The thought, though proceeding by a circuitous route, is not obscure.

An evil spirit is angered by the rejoicing in Heorot (ll. 86-90a). One of the songs recited in the hall is quoted (ll. 90b-98).² After looking back for a moment (ll. 99-100a)—as he often does, cf. note on ll. 20-25—the poet returns to Grendel, who is now spoken of as dwelling in the moors (ll. 100b-104a). This naturally leads the author to relate how Grendel came to live there, viz., by being descended from Cain, whom God had exiled for the murder of Abel (ll. 104b-114).³ Whereupon Grendel's first attack on Heorot is narrated.

The only apparent difficulty lurks in ll. 103b-6: *se þe moras heold, | fen ond fæsten, fifelcynnes eard | wonsæli wer weardode hwile, | sibðan him Scyppend forscrifen hæfde*, the second part of which might seem to refer to Cain. Now, it is true that originally Cain was proscribed, but with him all his offspring (*Caines cynn*), as we are informed in the following lines, so that the term *forscrifan* might without violence be applied to Grendel (or the *fifelcynn*). *wonsæli wer* is, of course, an entirely suit-

¹ *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XII, 205-25.

² Why should it not be a religious hymn? See Ten Brink, 12.

³ On the Jewish tradition (Book of Enoch) embodied in this account see Bouterwek, *Cædmon*, I, cxi ff., *Germania*, I, 401; Bugge, *Beitr.*, XII, 82.

able appellation of Grendel, who is also called *feasceafst guma* (l. 973), *earmsceapen* (l. 1351), *dreamum bedæled* (l. 721), etc.¹

Trautmann rejects the dative after *forscrifan*; also after *for-gripan* (l. 2353), *forswerian* (l. 804), *forleosian* (ll. 1470, 2145, 2861), *forgrindan* (l. 424)? The last-mentioned verb is actually deprived by him both of construction and existence.²

109. *ne gefeah he þære fæhðe*. Kemble, Ettmüller, L. Hall, and Cl. Hall refer *he* to *Drihten*, which is probably wrong; cf. *seeg weorce gefeh* (ll. 1569, 827). The meaning of the negative phrase comes to about the same as *ne byð him wihte ðy sel* (l. 2277). Earle translates well: "he profited not by that violence."

128. *þa wæs æfter wiste wop up ahafen*. It should no longer be doubted that *wist* signifies "feast," "feasting" (Cosijn, Trautmann, Kock): there is now weeping where there was formerly feasting. Cf. *hwæt, me þæs on eple edwendan cwom*, | *gyrn æfter gomene* (l. 1774); *þær his lichoma legerbedde fæst* | *swefeh æfter symle* (l. 1007) (*symle* not = *simle* "continuo," as Grein thought); *ða heo under swegle geseon meahte* | *morþor-bealo maga, þær he[o] ær mæste heold* | *worolde wynne* (l. 1078).³

131. *þolode ðryðswyð þegnsorge dreah*, | *syðþan hie þæs laðan last sceawedon*. Heinzel⁴ proposes a parenthesis of extraordinary dimensions, as he thinks the plural *hie* must be connected with *gumum* in l. 127. Still such a change from a singular to a plural subject is not to be considered objectionable; cf. *El.*, 56: *cýning wæs afyrhted*, | *egsan geaclad*, *siððan elþeodige*, | *Huna ond Hreða here sceawedon* (*ibid.*, 35, 55 f., 65 f., 125); *OE. Chron.*, 755 A.D.: *þa gebead he him . . . ond him cypdon*.

135. *ac ymb ane niht eft gefremede* | *morðbeala mare* cannot mean that Grendel took in the second night more than thirty

¹ If any emendation were to be thought of, the removal of l. 105 would relieve the passage: "who held the moors and the fenlands, which were the home of the race of monsters, since the Creator had proscribed it." These lines would be a close parallel, as to structure, to ll. 2036-38: *on him gladiað gomelra lafe* | *heard ond hringmæl Heaðabearna geatreon*, | *þenden hie ðam wæpnum wealdan moston* (" . . . which was the property of the H. while . . .").

² [Trautmann's objection to *him forscrifan* has been recently silenced by Sievers, *loc. cit.*]

³ Saxo, Book II, *ad fin.*: *ita conuiuio in exequias uerso, uictorie gaudium funeris luctus insequitur. Nibelungenlied* (ed. Lachmann), 2315: *mit leide was verendet* | *des küneges höhst*, | *als ie diu liebe leide ze aller jungiste git*.

⁴ *Anz. f. d. A.*, XV, 189.

thanes (Mallenhoff), or "wrought a yet worse deed of murder" (Arnold, so Heyne), but simply "... more (additional) murder." The tautological combination *eft . . . mare* is of substantially the same character as the cases of redundant epithets observed in ll. 1328 f., 66 f., 12 f. (*Modern Philology*, III, 247); cf. also *Judith*, 182: *and þæt swyðor gyt | ycan wolde*. Though no other instance of this use of the adjectival *mare* is known, an exactly analogous example of *mare* with partitive genitive occurs in *Oros.*, 82, 7: *he . . . wæs wilniende ðæt he ðæs gewinnes mehte mare gefremman*.

141. *gesægd soðlice sweotolan tacne*. Not "truthfully related on clear evidence" (Cl. Hall). *secgan* is used here, like *cyðan* in many places, in the sense of "make known (by deeds)," "manifest."

142. The emendation *helðegnes* (MS *healðegnes*) (Ettmüller Transl., Bugge, Holthausen,¹ Ten Brink, 15, Earle, Trautmann) can easily be spared. *healðegn* (applied to Grendel) is a compound just fitting the special occasion, like *cwealmeuma* (l. 792), *mudbona* (l. 2079), *beorscealc* (l. 1240), *morgensweg* (l. 129), *þegnsorg* (l. 131), *gudsele* (l. 443).²

161. *seomade ond syrede*. The vulgate interpretation "caught (or, oppressed) and entrapped" (Kemble, Thorpe, Ettmüller, H.-Socin, Wyatt, Garnett, L. Hall, Cl. Hall, Tinker) is entirely out of the question. *seomian* is = "remain," "linger," not without the idea of compulsory retention, "be fixed to" (see *Andr.*, 183 f.; *Gen.* 71 f.; *El.*, 694, *siomode in sorgum . . . under hearmlocan*; *Jul.*, 709, *seomað sorgcearig*), and *seomade ond syrede* suggests the phrase *wæs to fæst on þam* [i. e., *fyrenum*] (l. 137), perhaps = "kept on plotting, or ambushing." *on syrewe* (*searewe*) would be a more likely emendation than Trautmann's *on sweorce*, but equally superfluous. The paratactic construction *ond syrede* cannot be called abnormal.³

Grein's rendering "er lag Unheil brütend"⁴ was not far from the truth.⁵

¹ Also *Anglia-Beibl.*, IV, 35.

² Cf. O. Krackow, *Die Nominalcomposita als Kunstmittel im altenglischen Epos*, 40.

³ See *Anglia*, XXV, 276 f., for some characteristic prose examples.

⁴ See also Gering, *Z. f. d. P.*, XII, 123.

⁵ [Cf. Sievers' recent note, *loc. cit.*]

207 ff. There is no reason whatever for assuming an unskilful blending of two versions, or suspecting any other kind of disorder (Ten Brink, 32; Trautmann). It is only to be borne in mind that (1) *fyrst forð gewat* (l. 210) has pluperfect sense (Cosijn); cf. also l. 2119; (2) *sundwudu sohte* (l. 208) means "went to the ship" (not "on board"); (3) *secg wisade, | lagu-cræftig mon landgemyrcu* (ll. 208 f.) does not refer to a pilot, but to Beowulf,¹ who showed, or led the way to, the land boundary, i. e., the shore.²

276. *purh egsan*. Not "through terror," "by the terror of his coming," but rather "in a terrible manner." Cf. *purh hæstne had* (l. 1335), *purh hest* (*Riddl.*, 16, 28), *purh neod* (*Par. Ps.*, 139, 13), *purh lust* (*Dan.*, 249).³ [So probably *purh slidne nið* (l. 184), cf. *H. Archiv*, CXV, 178.]

303 ff. See Ettmüller,⁴ Bugge,⁵ Ten Brink, 33, Cosijn, Lübke,⁶ Münster,⁷ Sarrazin,⁸ Bright,⁹ Trautmann, Holthausen.¹⁰ Bright's emendation (which has been unduly ignored), *ferh wearde heold | guðmod grimmon*, offers the simplest solution paleographically, but is objectionable in its retention of the *ferh* ("pig"), which, moreover, would hardly have been personified by the designation "grimly warlike of mood." By far the most plausible reading of ll. 305b-6a is Bugge's *ferhwearde heold | guðmodgum men*. The change from the plural *eoforlic scionon* (for Bugge's *eofor licscionon* cannot be accepted) to the singular (to be taken collectively) is a little harsh, but appears by no means impossible.

307. *æltimbred*, MS. *sæltimber* (Ettmüller, *Scop.*), *saltimbre* (Ettmüller, Ed.) would be a compound like *healreced*, *healcern* (timber, (*ge*)timbre = *structura*¹¹). *sæl timbred*, first suggested by Kemble,¹² and commonly adopted since Grein's edition, may be compared to *wudu bunden* (l. 216), *nægledeneas* (*Brunanb.*, 53);

¹ Similarly, Sigfried is "sea-crafty": *die rechten wassersträze sint mir wol bekant* (*Nibel.*, 367).

² See Gering, *loc. cit.*, B.-T.; [cf. Sievers, *loc. cit.*].

³ *Journal of Germanic Philology*, IV, 104; Ziegler, *Der poetische Sprachgebrauch in den sogen. Cædmonschen Dichtungen*, 48.

⁴ *Scop.*

⁵ Also *Z. f. d. P.*, IV, 195 f.

⁶ *Anz. f. d. A.*, XIX, 342.

⁷ *Dissertation on Thomas Chestre's Launfal*, Thesis I, probably suggested by Sarrazin.

⁸ *Beowulf-Studien*, 38.

⁹ *Mod. Lang. Notes*, X, 43.

¹⁰ *Literaturbl.*, XXI, 64.

¹¹ Cf. *Anglia*, XXVII, 401.

¹² Vol. II, Appendix.

searonet seowed smipes orþancum (B., 406), *sincgim locen* (El., 264).

349. *wæs his modsefa manegum gecyðed, | wig ond wisdom.* Cl. Hall: "his courage, prowess and wisdom were well known to many." Similarly Earle, Garnett, L. Hall. It is more likely that *modsefa* "mind," "character" is meant as a general term followed by the more specific, explanatory words *wig ond wisdom* "valor and wisdom." Thus *frætwæ* is specified by *bill ond byrnan* (ll. 2620 f.); *untýdras* by *eotenas, ylfe, orcnæas, gígnatas* (ll. 111 ff.); perhaps *helm* by *foldan fæþm, fyrghenholt, gýfenes grund* (ll. 1392 ff.).¹

377. *Donne sægdon þæt sælipende | þa ðe gífsceattas Geata fyredon | þyder to þance.* The substitution of *hyder* for *þyder* (Cosijn) is exceedingly risky in view of the invariable employment of double alliteration in this metrical type.² Equally unsatisfactory is the reading *Geatum* (Thorpe, Bugge), because *ferian*, "carry," "convey," cannot be construed with the dative like *beran*, but requires *to* (cf. l. 1158); and, besides, (*to*) *Geatum* would be next to impossible by the side of *þyder*. Why should not *Geata* be made regular *genitivus objectivus*: "presents (not "tribute") for the Geats"?

Ten Brink's stylistic criticism³ is unjust. Ll. 377-81a express the very appropriate thought: "moreover (= *donne*), as I have heard from a reliable source (individualized epic formula, see A II, 1), he is a very strong man."

420. *þær* of the MS is a good deal better than *þæra* (Rieger, Holthausen). *þær* = "on that occasion," "then," or "when," occurs in other places; e. g., ll. 513, 550.

440. *ðær gelyfan sceal | Dryhtnes dome se þe hine deað nimeð.* This passage receives light from ll. 685 ff.: *ond sibðan witig God | on swa hwæþere hond halig Dryhten | mæroðo deme, | swa him gemet þince*, and ll. 977 ff. *gelyfan* seems, indeed, to mean "resign himself to" (Earle).⁴

457. *fere fyhtum þu, wine min Beowulf, | ond for arstafum usic sohtest.* A much mended and debated passage. Trautmann,

¹ Schröder, *Anglia*, XIII, 334 f.

² Kaluza, *Metrik des Beowulfliedes*, p. 13 f.

³ P. 33.

⁴ Cf. Grein I, note; Paul, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, s. v. "glauben."

who pleads at length for Thorpe's *fore fyhtum þu, freond min B.*, seems to have been unaware of the point made by Sievers.¹ That *for* should have been used here to denote purpose is not absolutely impossible, but *a priori* to be doubted, since this function even in prose is not at all common before the time of Ælfric.² *weorþmyn-dum*³ was mentioned by Cosijn⁴ only to be dismissed, presumably as being too far-fetched. Bugge's *wære ryhtum* fits the context most admirably, but we are loath to miss a *for* parallel with *for* in l. 458, as we find it in ll. 338 f.: *for wlenco . . . for wræcsi-ðum . . . for higeþrymmum*, ll. 508 f.: *for wlence . . . for dolgilpe* (*Gen.*, 1673,) and, in addition to it, *þu*, which cannot be relegated to the second half of the line (cf. ll. 1704, 530), is rather redundant metrically. These objections would be removed by reading *for werryhtum* (*wærryhtum*), *wine min B.*, which would mean, of course, a considerable departure from the MS.

Another possibility—nothing more—would be *werfestum* (= *wærfæstum*, adverbial dative, "loyally") *þu, wine min B.* The corruption *festum* > *fehtum* > *fyhtum* is not unnatural.

487. *akte ic holdra þy læs, | deorre dugude, þe þa deað fornam.* The sense of l. 488b (almost universally misapprehended), "since death had taken them away," is fully established by *Riddl.*, 10, 11: *heo hæfde swæstra þy læs | suna ond dohtra, þy heo swa dyde* (*ibid.*, 48, 5 f.); cf. *B.*, 1435: *he on holme wæs | sundes þe sænra, ðe hyne swyllt fornam.*

535. *wit þæt gecwædon (. . . ond gebeotedon . . . þæt)* = "we agreed." So Thorpe⁵ (*K. Ælfred's Will*): *ða gecwædon wit . . . ðæt.*

601b-3a. It is not a little surprising that, with the exception of Kemble and Thorpe, who, however, misconstrue *Geata* (Holder's view of the case remains doubtful), nobody seems to have seen that *guþe* is parallel with *eafod ond ellen*, and does not signify "in battle."

644. *oð þæt semninga. . . .* The meaning of *semninga* should not be pressed, nor that of *færinga* in l. 1414: *oþ þæt he færinga . . .* (cf. l. 1988). Certainly the phrase does not

¹ *Z. f. d. P.*, XXI, 362; *Beitr.*, IX, 138.

² H. G. Shearin, *loc. cit.*, 42 ff.

³ Holthausen, *Literaturbl.*, XXI, 64: (*for*) *weorðmyndum*. ⁴ *Aant.* ⁵ *Dipl. Angl.*, 485.

imply that "with sunset the panic returned" (Earle). It looks as if these adverbs were merely added to accentuate the meaning of the conjunction, just as in some cases of (*siddan*) *ærest*, (*siddan*) *furðum*; *syððan* . . . *edre* (*El.*, 1002); perhaps *þonne* . . . *oft* (*Beow.*, 2867).

665-68. See Müllenhoff, 117; Schönbach,¹ Bachlehner,² Bugge, Holthausen,³ Trautmann, Binz.⁴ The blessing of well-considered conservatism is strikingly illustrated by the history of the textual criticism of these lines. Trautmann's *waldend* and *halþegn* for *wuldor* stand self-condemned, and his *eoton weard abad* displays a bold disregard of the regular construction of *abidan*.⁵ Holthausen's successive emendations *wuldre* and *wildor* are rendered improbable by two considerations; viz., first, that such bare collocations as *wildor* (*wuldre*) | *Grendle* are not in accordance with the usual manner of "variation" (*ða wæs swigra secg sunu Eclafes*, l. 980, and *þæt winreced*, | *gestsele*, l. 993 are not quite analogous; the opposite order occurs: *bruc ðisses beages*, *Beowulf leofa*, | *hyse mid hæle*, l. 1216), and, secondly, that it would require stronger arguments than have been advanced so far to prove that the subject is Hroðgar, not God (cf. Schönbach). No valid argument has been brought forward against Müllenhoff's old translation: "Gott hatte gegen Grendel, wie es die Menschen erfuhren, einen Saalhüter gesetzt: der versah den Sonderdienst um den Herrn der Dänen und leistete (bot dar) die Riesenwache," which has been substantially adopted by Grein, Holder, Earle, Wyatt, Garnett, Cl. Hall. It remains to state briefly that (1) *kyningwuldor* is easily identified with *kyninga wuldor* (Bugge), = God, or Christ;⁶ cf. *lifwyn(n)*: *lifes wyn(n)*, *holmþracu*: *yða gepræc*, etc.; the emendation *kyninga wuldor* (first propounded by Kemble⁷ and Thorpe), though metrically admissible,⁸ is not needed; (2) the subject of *sundornytte beheold* is not God (L. Hall), but Beowulf the thane; cf. *þegn nytte beheold* (l. 494);

¹ *Ans. f. d. A.*, III, 40.

² *Z. f. d. A.*, VIII, 201.

³ Also *Literaturbl.*, XXI, 64; *Anglia-Beibl.*, XIII, 204 f.

⁴ *Anglia-Beibl.*, XIV, 359 f.

⁵ The only example of an accusative cited by Shipley, 21, is based on an erroneous conception of the passage.

⁶ See *Sprachsch.*

⁷ Appendix to Vol. II.

⁸ Sievers, *Beitr.*, X, 234; Kaluza: type 31.

(3) the difficulty of the form *eotonweard* in place of *eotonwearde* vanishes by the simple assumption of elision.¹

681. *nat he para goda, þæt he me ongean slea.* Cf. *Ælfr., Hom., I, 190, 31: þæt folc ne cuþe þæra goda, þæt hi cwædon þæt he God wære* (*Mald. 176 f.*).²

694. *þæt hie ær to fela micles | in þæm winsele wældeað fornam | Denigea leode.* It is hardly necessary to cancel *hie* (Bugge) or change it to *hiera*.³ The co-ordination of *hie* and (to) *fela* seems to be permissible, at least if we may trust the analogy of *fea*(we) and *sume*. It is further to be understood that *leode* is not genitive singular (Grein; Kluge, *loc. cit.*; Holder), but accusative plural, parallel with *hie*; cf. *Norðdenum . . . anra gehwylcum* (ll. 783; 767 f., 2124 f., etc). See *Modern Philology*, III, 255.

756. *ne wæs his drohtod þær, | swylce he on ealderdagum ær gemette.* Trautmann wishes to change *swylce* to *swylcne*. But what is to be done with *swylce* in passages like the following: *we ne magon ælc þing ongitan swyle swylce hit bið* (*Boeth., 147, 16*); *hu ænig mon mehte swelce burg gewyrcean swelce sio wæs* (*Oros., 74, 8*)?⁴

765. *þæt (bæt he MS) wæs geocor sið, | þæt se harmscapa to Heorute ateah.* Contrary to the usual view of the construction, I hold that *þæt* in l. 766 is the ordinary conjunction and *ateon* used intransitively, just as *teon* in several undoubted cases. This intercalated observation of the author's is strongly suggestive of instances like *ne wæs þæt forma sið, | þæt he Hroþgares ham gesohte* (ll. 716, 1463 f., 1527 f., 2625 ff.); *ne wæs þæt eðe sið, | þæt . . .* (l. 2586; cf. ll. 2532 ff.).

779. *þæt hit a mid gemete manna ænig . . . tobrecan meakte.* I cannot believe in the customary rendering of *mid gemete*, "with strength" (Kemble, Ettmüller, Arnold, Garnett, Earle, L. Hall, Cl. Hall, Tinker), still less in Trautmann's "correc-

¹ Cf. Rieger, *loc. cit.*, 404; Sievers, *Beitr.*, X, *passim*; Kaluza, *Altengl. Vers.*, I, 49; Cremer, *Metr. u. sprachl. Untersuchung der ae. Gedichte Andreas, Guðlac, etc.*, 3; Fuhr, *Metrik des westgerman. Allitterationsverses*, 47 f.

² [No need of *gude* (Trautmann's edition=Thorpe), *guda*, Holthausen, *Anglia-Beiblatt*, XV, 177].

³ Kluge, *Beitr.*, IX, 189.

⁴ *Boeth.*, 63, 22; 64, 6; *Ben. R.* 12. 20 f.; *Ælfric, Saints*, III, 503, etc., etc.; cf. *Sprachsch.*, II, 514 f.

tion," *mægenelne*. In view of *nænige gemete* = *nullo modo* (*Bede*, 76, 22; *Dial. Gr.* 215, 23), *ealle gemete* = *omnimodo* (*Bede*, 86, 8), *to hwylcum gemete* (*Blickl. Hom.* 5, 7; *ibid.*, 237, 12), and the well-substantiated adverbial use of *mid gemete* (*Hittle*, 61), it is quite reasonable to credit *mid gemete* with the sense of "in any wise," as Thorpe translated it long ago.

Other examples of *mid* with modal function are the (semi-adverbial) phrases *mid rihte* (l. 2056), *mid geweoldum* (l. 2222), *mid elne* (l. 1493), *mid arstafum* (l. 317). See *Hittle*, 53ff.

816. *him on eazle wearð | syndolh sweotol*. Not "there was on his shoulder an evident wound," (Garnett, *Ettmüller*), but *wearð sweotol* is = "became visible."

833. *þæt wæs tacen sweotol*, "that was clearly proved."¹

868. *guma gilphlæden*. As (se) *gylpgeornest(a)* (*Bede* 92, 4) (= *gloriae cupidissimus*) is = *lofgeornost* (*Beow.*, 3183), and *gilp* appears in tautological combination with *lof* in *Cur. P.*, 209, 18, *gilphlæden* may be considered equivalent to (a hypothetical) *lofhlæden*, "covered with glory," "renowned." Cf. also *lofsalig*, *Heliand*, 176.

871. *secg eft ongan*. . . . Ten Brink (61) derives from the use of *eft* an argument for his pet theory of the origin of our *Beowulf*, but overlooks—what seems to have been quite generally overlooked—that this *eft* (= *item* [*rursum*], not *denuo*²) properly goes with *hwilum* in l. 867 (there should be no period or colon before *secg*), and that *hwilum* . . . *eft* corresponds with *hwilum* in l. 864. The case is parallel to ll. 2107–11: *hwilum* . . . *hwilum* . . . *hwilum* . . . *eft*; *Guðl.*, 879–82: *hwilum* . . . *hwilum* . . . *eft* . . . *hwilum* . . . *eft*.³ The only peculiarity of the passage in question is the insertion of some descriptive and explanatory matter (epithets, relative clause, parenthetical clause) between *cyninges þegn* and *secg*, but this cannot be considered out of keeping with the OE. style.

We can do without Rieger's emendation⁴ *secgan*, not to mention Trautmann's innovations.

¹ See *Anglia*, XXV, 230, for analogous expressions in OE. prose.

² See *Sprachsch.*

³ *Met. Boeth.*, 20, 214f.; cf. *Riddl.*, 4, 36–38; *Bede*, 54, 17.

⁴ Cf. Bugge, *Z. f. d. P.*, IV, 203.

898-901. The punctuation is wrong in all editions and translations, except Heyne, 4, Simons, and Ettmüller (the latter, however, fails to place l. 900 *b* in parenthesis), although Mällenhoff (p. 119) gave the correct explanation many years since:¹ *se wæs wreccena wide mærost , siððan Heremodes hild swedrode*. Similar constructions are found in *Brunanb.*, 65ff.: *ne wearð wæl mare folces gefylled siþpan eastan hider | Engle and Seaxe upp becomon*. *Wids.*, 45ff., *Hroþwulf and Hroðgar heoldon lengest | sibbe ætsomne suhtorfædran, | siþpan hy forwæcon Wicinga cynn*. *Beow.*, 1197 ff.

992. *fela þæra wæs, | wera ond wifa*. The indispensable comma after *wæs* is lacking in nearly all editions.

1005. *genyded* belongs in the numerous class of useless emendations. *genyddde stowe* is simply "the place forced upon him;" cf. *benda onlysed | nīpum genedde* (MS *geneðde*), *Crist* (ll. 68 f.). Nor is the insertion of *gehwylc* or *æghwylc* at all mandatory, since a pronominal subject is easily supplied from ll. 1002f., just as in ll. 1290f. . . . *þa hine se broga angeat*.² The genitives in ll. 1004ff. depend on *gearwe stowe*; cf. *Hel.*, 4450, *thar is lif euuig, | gigareuuid Godes riki godaro thiado*.

1224. *wes, þenden þu lifige, | æþeling, eadig*. Wyatt contends in vain against this punctuation of Wülker's (used also by Ettmüller and Grein, 2). The adjective is to be taken predicatively, as in l. 407: *wæs þu, Hroðgar, hal*; l. 980: *ða wæs swigra secg sunu Eclafes* (not = "a silenter man was then the son of Ecglaf," Earle); ll. 816f, 805ff., 2309.

1240. *beorscealca sum*. Not "a certain beer-servant" (Garnett, and similarly others), but "many a one of the beer-drinkers." It is true, only one man is actually killed, but the fate was, as it were, hanging over them all; cf. also ll. 1234f. On a previous occasion all men present were in expectation of death (ll. 691ff.), and Grendel intended to entrap many a one, *sumne besyrwan* (l. 713). The collective force of the singular *sum* (by litotes, perhaps) may be compared to the same use of nouns (ll. 6, 795, 1243ff., 1110ff., 297, 492), cf. *Modern Philology*, III, 249 f.

¹ Cf. Rieger, *loc. cit.*, p. 390, n. 2; Sievers, *Beowulf und Sazo*, 179.

² See Pogatscher, *Anglia*, XXIII, 23, 206 f.

1246. *wæs þeaw hyra, | þæt hie oft wæron an wig gearwe.* A similar redundancy of phrase is noticed in *Dial. Gr.*, 194, 25: *se wæs gewunod, þæt he oft . . .*; *Bede*, 446, 9: *be þam bysceope oft gewunelice sæde . . .*; *ibid.*, 188, 30; cf. *B.*, 164f.: *fela . . . oft.* *an wig gearwe* is preferable to *ānwiggearwe* (Ettmüller,¹ Grein, 2; presumably Walker), *an(d)wiggearwe* (Cosijn,² Holder, Holthausen),³ since these compounds are rather doubtful as to formation, and the former also as to sense, but *gearu* with *on* (*in*) is found in other places, as *on bæl gearu* (*B.*, 1109), *in gefeoht gearo* (*Cræft.*, 90); *El.*, 222f., *Guðl.*, 1148.⁴ Moreover it appears especially adapted to the context, since it seems to denote primarily "in suitable condition for," or "ready to go (on a journey)," not "prepared in mind," "willing." (*bæles gearu* would have been impossible.) That l. 1247a is an impossible specimen of type A3 has not been proved.

1519. *mægenræs forgeaf | hildebille.* Literally "he gave a mighty impetus to his battle-sword," not "he gave a strong stroke with his battle-bill," as rendered by Garnett and (with little variations) the other translators.

1530. *mæg Hylaces.* Normalized to *Hygelaces* (*Higelaces*) in all editions, except H.-Socin, 6, 7, whereby an interesting feature of the MS is destroyed. *Hylaces* is from *Hyglaces* (not *Hygelaces*), as *oferhyda* (l. 1760) from *oferhygda*, *wonhygdum* (l. 434) from *wonhygdum*. Also *Wilaf* (l. 2852) has been "corrected" to *Wiglaf* in all editions except Grein, 2; Holder, 2; Socin, 6, 7.⁵

1550. *Hæfde ða forsiðod sunu Ecgþeowes | under gynne grund.* *gynne grund* is not "sea-bottom," "abyss" (Kemble, Grein, 2; Socin, Arnold, Earle, L. Hall, Cl. Hall, Tinker), but, like *eormen-ground*, unquestionably "earth," Cf. Bode, *Kenningar*, 66.

1604. *wiston ond ne wendon.* The explanation of *wiston* as = *wiscton*,⁷ which is still rejected by Wyatt and Cl. Hall, receives additional support from the formula-like character of the combination *wyscan* (*willan*) *ond wenan*. Thus *wyscað ond wenað* (*Guðl.*, 47); *wendun ge ond woldun* (*ibid.*, 635; *Andr.*, 1072); *woldon ond wendon* (*Bede*, 308, 11).

¹ Scop., Ed. ² Beitr., VIII, 570. ³ Also *Anglia-Beibl.*, IV, 35. ⁴ See also L. Hall's note

⁵ Sievers, *Beitr.*, X, 463.

⁶ See Balbring, § 530.

⁷ See Cosijn, *Beitr.*, VIII, 571.

1634. *cyningbalde men*. Bugge: *cyningholde*. Grein (Ten Brink, 82), Cosijn: *cynebalde*. But if *cynebald* is matched by *cynerof* (Cosijn), *cyningbald* is equally good as *bregorof* (l. 1925).

1665. *þa me sæl ageald* is a formula which Grein, 1 mutilated by substituting *hie* for *me*. Cf. *Gen.*, 2008: *þa sæl ageald*; *B.*, 2690: *þa him rum* ("opportunity," not "space") *ageald*; *Mald.*, 121: *þa he byre hæfde*.

1688ff. Blackburn¹ revives Ettmüller's theory that "the passage, before it was Christianized, contained an allusion to the Northern tale of the war of the gods with the giants." This seems to me unproven and improbable. Are not the giants the same as those of l. 113, and is not the whole passage merely an amplified version of the brief allusion of ll. 113f. (*swylce gigantas, þa wið Gode wunnon | lange þrage, he him ðæs lean forgeald*)? There is no need to look for any other source than Genesis, chaps. 6 and 7 (or some apocryphal account derived from it), especially 6:4 ("gigantes autem erant super terram in diebus illis . . . isti sunt potentes a saeculo viri famosi"), 5-7; 7:17, 21.

1705. *eal þu hit gepyldum healdest, | mægen mid modes snyttrum*. Brooke's translation,² "thou holdest thy fame with patience, and thy might with prudence of mind," ignores the phrasal character ("distribution") of *eal . . . mægen mid modes snyttrum*. Cf. *eall . . . wongas ond wicstede* (l. 2461), and Sievers' note on *Hel.*, 40; also *æghwæpres . . . worda ond worca* (ll. 287, 1043ff).

gepyldum is not "with patience" (Kemble, Thorpe, Grein, Arnold, Garnett, Brooke, Morris-Wyatt, Tinker), but "steadily." Cf. *Cræft.*, 79: *sum gepyld hafað, | fæstgongel ferð*. The dative plural is used adverbially like *willum* (l. 1821), *lustum* (l. 1653), *listum* (l. 781), *searwum* (l. 2764), *snyttrum* (l. 872), *estum* (l. 2378), *dreamum* (l. 99), *þeawum* (l. 2144), *arum* (l. 296), *þrymmum* (l. 235), *strengum* (l. 3117), *unwearnum* (l. 741), *fyrenum* (l. 2441; not "wickedly," "with treachery" in this place, as it is commonly rendered, but "exceedingly,"³ "greatly"),

¹ Loc. cit., 218.

² *Early English Literature*, 19.

³ Nor is *fyrendearf* (l. 14) = "Elend durch feindliche Nachstellungen" (Heyne-Socin), but "great distress."

inwilpancum (l. 749; cf. *El.*, 308; *Andr.*, 559; *purh inwilpanc*, *Andr.*, 670; *mid his hetepancum*, *B.*, 475).

1728ff. Whatever the meaning of *lufan* may be (Müllenhoff, 131; Sarrazin;¹ Cosijn; cf. Thiele² on *lufen*), the analogy of another passage, ll. 2885ff., should be taken note of. Cf. the parallel terms *lufan*, *on eble eorþan wyne*, *hleoburh wera*, *side rice* (1728ff.) and *edelwyn*, *lufen*, *londriht* (2885f.). Also *Hel.*, 3302ff., may be compared: *thes odagan mannes the her al habad | giuwendid an thene uueroldscat uuilleon sinen, | modgithahti*.

1807ff. See Müllenhoff, 131f; Hornburg, 29; Heinzel,³ Schneider,⁴ Schröder,⁵ Jellinek-Kraus⁶. "Than the brave son of Ecglað had Hrunting brought (cf. ll. 1023f.), bade [him] take his sword, the precious weapon; he [i. e., Beowulf] thanked him for that gift, said he considered that war-friend good, etc." Just a word of comment. The subject of l. 1810 (*cwæð . . .*) must be the same as that of l. 1809 (for the introduction of indirect speech by *cwæð* following a more general preliminary announcement, see ll. 2156ff., 2937ff., 3179ff., 856f., 90ff., cf. *Modern Philology*, III, 245); that the sword praised in ll. 1810ff. should be that of Beowulf (ll. 1488ff.) is much less likely than that Hrunting is meant, which had been really tried in the battle; besides, the expression *þæs leanes* (with definite article) naturally refers to the *sweord* mentioned before. The change of the subject (from *Unferð* to Beowulf) in l. 1809 is not more violent than some instances in the story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard, *OE. Chron.*, 755 A. D.; the omission of the pronominal subject, like that of the object in l. 1808, needs no further defense. The fact that Hrunting had been restored to *Unferð* has been passed over as irrelevant; but the presentation of a parting gift (cf. ll. 1866ff.) to the hero is properly dwelt upon with some emphasis. *lean* is "gift" (Heinzel; Karsten,⁷ though probably with the subaudition of "present given in appreciation of services rendered" (to the

¹ *Beowulf-Studien*, 104.

² *Konsonantische Suffixe*, 78.

³ *Ans. f. d. A.*, X, 224; XV, 192.

⁴ *Der Kampf mit Grendels Mutter*, 21f. (1)

⁵ *Anglia*, XIII, 337ff.

⁶ *Z. f. d. A.*, XXXV, 279ff.

⁷ *Engl. Stud.*, XVII, 420.

Danes). (A more general sense than "reward" seems to attach also to *med* in l. 1178).

It cannot be denied that the interpretation of the whole passage would be a good deal simpler, if it could be so construed as to refer to Beowulf's returning Hrunting to its owner. But it is doubtful if the meaning of the *lean* could be sufficiently stretched to permit this. As soon as we change the form *leanes*, we face other objections.

1864. *ge wið feond ge wið freond fæste geworhte*. See *Aant.*; further Ælfric, *Saints XXXI*, 307: *mislice geworhtne*; Ælfric, *Gen.*, 31, 5: *ðæt he nys swa wel wið me geworht swa he wæs gystrandæg*.

1903. In favor of Rieger's *gewat him on naca* (MS *nacan*) we may cite *Brunanb.*, 35: *cread cneor on flot*; also *Beow.*, 217: *gewat þa ofer wægholm winde gefysed*; cf. *Hel.*, 2265: *thie naco furthor scred(C)*. Socin's objection is to be met by the consideration that *on* may well be understood as *on wæter*, especially as it is immediately followed by *drefan deop wæter*.

1968. *bona* is not "enemy,"¹ but "slayer," though in this case Hygelac has performed the deed only by proxy.² *bona Ongen-peoes* is curiously suggestive of the surnames *Hundingsbani*, *Fáfnisbani* (cf. *Ísungs bani*, *Helgakv. Hund.*, I, 20).

1978 f. Without a single exception, the editors and translators make *mandryhten* nominative (*syððan mandryhten . . . holdne gegrette*). But is it not more natural to take it as accusative: "after he (Beowulf) had greeted his gracious lord"? It is Beowulf's part to greet the king in a solemn address (*meaglum wordum*). See ll. 407 ff.³

2018. For *bædde*, which is in fact unintelligible, *bælde* may be hazarded as a possible and better reading: *bælde byre geonge, oft hio beahwriðan | secge [sealde], ær hie to selle geong*. A similar use of this verb is seen in ll. 1093 f. (*Folcwaldan sunu . . . Dene weorþode, . . . hringum wenede, | efne swa swiðe sincgestreonum | fættan goldes*), *swa he Fresena cyn on beorsele byldan wolde*.

¹ Heinzel, *Anz. f. d. A.*, XV, 192.

² See Earle's note, which is sufficient to dispel the doubts of Schemmann, 74.

³ [The correct translation is now found in Trautmann's edition.]

2041. *þonne cwið æt beore, se ðe beah gesyhd.* To an unprejudiced reader *beah* refers to a sword (cf. l. 2047, *meaht ðu, min wine, mece gecnawan*), though it has often been understood as "ring," "collar." The conjectures of Grein, 1 (*bill?*), and Bugge (*ba*) are not needed, if we take *beag* in the more general sense of "ornament," "precious thing." *beagas* = "treasure," "things of value" is well known (see, e. g., ll. 523, 2635; 80 [*beagas* parallel with *sinc*]), and *beaggifa* is = *sincgifa, maðumgifa, hordweard*. If, then, *maðum*, "treasure," "anything precious," is applied to a sword (see l. 1528 and especially l. 2055), why not *beag*?

A similar extension of meaning is seen in *headoreaf* (401), literally *vestis bellica* (Grein), but here "armor" in general, used with reference to shields and spears (ll. 397 f.). Cf. Cosijn,¹ who speaks, however, too severely of a "logische fout."

2152. *Het ða in beran eafor heafodsegn.* Kluge; Holder, 1; Köppel;² *ealdor*. Grein; Heyne, 1, 2, 3; Wülker;³ Arnold; Heinzel;⁴ Cosijn; Holthausen: *eaforheafodsegn*. Heyne, 4; H. Socin, 5; Wyatt: *eafor, heafodsegn*. H. Socin, 6, 7; Holder, 2: *eafor heafodsegn*. It seems to me that Rieger's aversion to *decomposita* was entirely justified, and that *eafor heafodsegn* (which must, of course, be identical with the *segn gylden* of l. 1021) is an example of asyndetic collocation—which even Grein⁵ considered possible—like *wudu wælsceaftas* (l. 398), *ides aglæcwif* (l. 1259), etc.⁶ As to this *eafor*, might it not denote a "boar banner," similar to the Danish and Norse "raven banners" (also *OE. Chron.*, 878 A. D.)?⁷

2156. *sume worde het, | þæt ic his ærest ðe est gesægde, | cwæð, þæt hyt hæfde Hiorogar cyning, | leod Scyldunga, lange hwile; | no ðy ær suna sinum syllan wolde . . .* Discussed by Rieger, Schröer,⁸ L. Hall. Considering the regular way of introducing indirect speech,⁹ it appears that *þæt ic his ærest ðe est gesægde* must be a general statement of the same import as that of the following lines introduced by *cwæð*. *est* may be "bequest,"

¹ *Aant*.² *Eng. Stud.*, XIII, 468.³ Sievers, *Beitr.*, IX, 137; note on *Hel.*, 20.⁴ Also *Anglia*, VIII, *Anz.*, 169.⁷ Cf. Lehmann, *Brünne und Helm*, 30.⁵ *Anz. f. d. A.*, XV, 190.⁸ *Anglia*, XIII, 342 f.⁶ *Sprachsch.*, I, 235.⁹ See note on ll. 1807 ff.

"bequeathing" (cf. *syllan* [l. 2160], almost = *unnan*), and *his est* may express "its transmission," so that the meaning of l. 2157 would ultimately come near to Grein's old rendering, "that I of the pedigree thereof should report to thee" (Earle). The use of the adverb *ærest* is perhaps to be compared to that of *æfter* (ll. 12, 2731).¹

2222. *Nealles mid geweoldum wyrmhorda cræft | sylfes willum, se ðe him sare gesceod.*—Might it not be *wyrmhord astread?* *strudan* with the object *hord* occurs in l. 3126; *Riddl.*, 54, 10 f. The subject is the same as the *p[egn]* *nathwylces | hæleda bearna* (2224).²

2287. *wroht wæs geniwad.* Not "strife was renewed," but (literally) "strife (quarrel) arose which previously did not exist." The same function of *niwian* should be recognized in *Exod.*, 35; cf. *niwe*, *B.*, 783.

2330. *ofer ealde riht.* Socin, followed by Wyatt, persists in talking of "the ten commandments" in this place;³ and Holder, Garnett, L. Hall, and Tinker consider *riht* a plural form,⁴ whereas it is simply accusative singular, preceded by the weak adjective (*Barnouw*, 51), "contrary to old law." Cf. *Ags. Laws*, *Hloðh. & Eadr.*, 12, *an eald riht.*

2448. *ond he him helpan ne mæg | eald ond infrod ænige gefremman.* Before Kock's explanation can be allowed, an authentic case of *ænige* = *ænige þinga* should be produced. Until then, Sievers' eminently plausible comment on *helpan*⁵ will stand.

2527. *ic eom on mode from, | þæt ic wið þone guðflogan gylp ofersitte.* The loose use of *þæt* is by no means exceptional, so that the conjectural *þæs* (Sievers, Holthausen)⁶ is to be rejected. The conjunction *þæt* is found to denote the relation between two facts in the vaguest possible manner; as Ten Brink⁷ has pointed out, it may even be translated by *indem*.⁸ Thus *sumne Geata leod of flanbogan feores getwæfde, | . . . þæt him on aldre*

¹ Note on l. 12.

² [Trautmann in his edition has proposed the same emendation.]

³ Cf. Lichtenheld, *Z. f. d. A.*, XVI, 371.

⁴ Cf. Koehler, *Germania*, XIII, 143.

⁵ *Z. f. d. P.*, XXI, 357.

⁶ Also *Anglia-Beibl.*, IV, 35.

⁷ *Pauls Grdr.*, II, 528.

⁸ Cf. Tolman, *Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass.*, III, 35.

stod | herestræl hearda (ll. 1432, 2830, 2577); (*ac me geuðe ylða Waldend, | þæt ic geseah sweord*) *þæt ic ðy wæpne gebræd* (l. 1664). Even the notorious passage, ll. 2697-2702, branded by Rieger as an "ungeheuerliches Satz-geschiebe," may safely be left alone; the lines *ac sio hand gebarn | modiges mannes, þær he his mæges* (em.) *healp, | þæt he þone niðgæst niðor hwene sloh* would not profit in the least by changing *þæt* to *þa* (Thorpe, Rieger).¹

2570 ff. The clause *ðær he þy fyrste forman dogore | wealdan moste*, which looks like an individualized variety of the formula *gif he (ic) wealdan mot*, is to be interpreted with reference to the preceding remark: *læssan hwile þonne his myne sohte*. "The shield gave good protection to the life and body of the illustrious lord for a shorter time than his heart desired, if he might (control, or) have controlled the (allotted) space of time (on the first day, i. e.) for the first time in his life, as fate did not assign to him glory in battle." The last clause is of a similar nature to *swa hyt no sceolde* (l. 2585). For the *ðær*-clause, cf. *Jul.*, 570, *El.*, 979.

2623. *geaf him ða mid Geatum guðgewæda, | æghwæs unrim. guðgewæda* is commonly held to be genitive plural, but I suspect it is = the normal form *guðgewædu*, accusative plural, with *æghwæs unrim* added appositively, as ll. 3134 f., *wunden gold, æghwæs unrim*. See note on l. 694. Ettmüller seems to be the only one who ever disliked this genitive, for in the *Scopas* he printed *guðgewædu*, though in the Edition he returned to the ordinary interpretation.

2684b-2686. More to the point than Jellinek-Kraus's rationalistic comment² on *se ðe meca gehwane swenge ofersohte* would have been a reference to Saxo, Book IV (Holder, p. 115): "Oblatis compluribus [gladiis], Vffo manu capulum stringens, frust<r>atim singulos agitando comminuit, nec erat quisquam ex eis tanti rigoris gladius, quem non ad prime concussionis motum crebra parcium fraccione dissolueret." See Jantzen's note.³ Cf.

¹ Bede, 126, 6, *mid worde his gebeda won, þæt he foreþingode*; *ibid.*, 128, 9.

² *Z. f. d. A.*, XXXV, 269.

³ [Also Socin, 7, adds a reference to this passage.]

also Heinzel, *Sitz. Ber. der Akad. d. Wiss., Wien, Phil.-hist. Cl.*, XCVII, 155; *Völsunga Saga*, chaps. 15, 35; Saxo, Book II (Holder, p. 44): *manus aemula ferri | gestamen studeat condecorare suum*.

2836. *Huru þæt on lande lyt manna ðah | mægenagenda . . . þæt he wið attorsceaðan oreðe geræsde . . .* These lines, meant in commendation of the unique heroism of Beowulf, are in need of elucidation. "This indeed has prospered with few men" is the received translation, which presupposes the unsubstantiated use of *lyt* as dative, for the construction of *ðeon* with accusative *lyt* (Socin) is not to be thought of. I prefer to make *lyt*, "few men"—i. e., "no one"—the subject, and to take *ðeon* in the sense of "attain," "achieve," as it is found, e. g., in *Bede*, 234, 10, *æfter fæce gebah* (varr. *gedeah*), *þæt hine mon to mæssepreoste gehalgode*, and other passages cited in *Anglia*, XXVII, 282; also *Gnom. Cott.*, 44 f.

FR. KLAEBER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.



CHAUCER'S "LITEL CLERGEON"

Mediaeval writers were too much occupied for the most part, with themes of high romance and the pageantry of kings to stoop to such trivial matters as village schools. All the more welcome, therefore, is the glimpse of the fourteenth-century schoolboy which Chaucer gives us in the *Prioresses Tale*. Though the "litel scole" in which the seven-year-old martyr learned his "prymer" is sketched with few strokes, the outlines of the picture are clear. Chaucer, it is true, has chosen to place the scene of his story "in Asie, in a greet citee," but the school which he describes is thoroughly English.

The school attended by the clergeon is of the type in which the great majority of the English lads of Chaucer's time gained such education as they possessed. It was not one of the famous schools maintained by some of the great monasteries or cathedrals; there is as background to the picture no massive abbey or dim Gothic aisle. This school plainly was of a humbler sort; instead of adjoining some church or abbey, it was situated in the least desirable part of the town, close by the Jewish quarter:

A litel scole of Cristen folk ther stood
Doun at the ferther ende, in which ther were
Children an heep, yeomen of Cristen blood,
That lerned in that scole yeer by yeer
Swich maner doctrine as men vsed there,
This is to seyn, to singen and to rede,
As smale children doon in hir childhede.
Among thise children was a widwes sone,
A litel clergeon, seuen yeer of age,
That day by day to scole was his wone.

It is difficult to see how a village school could have been more explicitly indicated, yet Professor Skeat seems to regard it as merely a school for choir-boys. "Clergeon," he tells us in his note on this passage, is "not a 'young clerk' merely, as Tyrwhitt says, but a happily chosen word implying that he was a chorister as well. . . . It means therefore 'a chorister-boy.'" Professor

Skeat's authority as a Chaucerian commentator is such that his opinion in this matter has been accepted by scholars without question.

Nevertheless, when one examines the account which Chaucer gives, difficulties in the way of regarding the clergeon as a chorister-boy at once present themselves. In the first place, on the very face of the narrative, the clergeon does not join with his companions in the school in singing the *Alma redemptoris*, as a chorister certainly should, but instead he listens to the anthem as it was sung by the others:

This litel child his litel book lerninge,
As he sat in the scole at his prymer,
He *Alma redemptoris* herde singe,
As children lerned hir antiphoner;
And, as he dorste, he drough hym ner and ner,
And herkned ay the wordes and the note,
Til he the firste vers coude al by rote.

I

But "clergeon," according to Professor Skeat, necessarily means chorister. In support of this definition he appeals to Randle Cotgrave's *French-English Dictionary*: "And Cotgrave has—'*Clergeon*, a singing man or Quirester in a Queer.'" Unfortunately, however, in this quotation Professor Skeat has omitted an essential part of Cotgrave's definition. Two forms of the word are registered by Cotgrave, and are defined as follows:

Clergeau: A pettie Clarke, vnder Clarke, or young Clarke.

Clergeon: as *Clergeau*; or a singing man, or Quirester, in a Queere.

By his omission of the three words which I have italicized above, Professor Skeat ignores the fact that "clergeon" is here recognized, first of all, as a synonym of "clergeau." The effect of this oversight is to restrict Cotgrave's definition of the word to what is actually the second meaning given.

Similarly in the *New English Dictionary* the first meaning given for our word is not "chorister," but "young clerk."¹ In Mätzner's *Middle-English Dictionary*, on the other hand,

¹ The definition in the *New English Dictionary* runs as follows: "Clergion, A young clerk or member of a clerical order; a chorister or choir-boy, also (as in Fr.) a term of depreciation = petty clerk."

*Chorknabe*¹ stands as the first definition of "clergeon." But, besides the passage in Chaucer, Mätzner cites only two instances of the word—one in the *Confessio Amantis*, the other in Robert of Brunne's translation of Langtoft's *Chronicle*—neither of which carries this distinctive meaning. The clergeon in Gower's story² is afterward referred to as a "yonge clerke"³ or simply as a "clerc;"⁴ nothing is said anywhere of his employment as a chorister. In the translation of Langtoft⁵ "clergeon" is a contemptuous diminutive applied by King Henry to Beket, equivalent to "petty clerk."

Indeed, I have been unable to find a single case in Middle English where "clergeon" is used with the definite meaning "choir-boy."⁶ In the anonymous rhyming chronicle (about 1325 A. D.), printed in Ritson's collection, we read that King Alfred, dividing his income among various charities, sent "the thridde to povre cleregouns."⁷ When one bears in mind the multitude of references in mediæval documents to the bestowal of alms *pauperibus scholaribus*, it seems altogether likely that "povre cleregouns" is here to be regarded as an equivalent phrase.

Our word occurs again, with slightly varied spelling, in *Piers Plowman*. The poet tells us that, at the close of his interview with Dame Scripture,

She called [to ken] me a clerionun that hyzte

Omnia-probate, a pore thing with-alle.

"Thou shalt wende with Wil," quod she, "whiles that him lykyth,

Til ȝe come to the burghe *quod-bonum-est-tenete*!"⁸

Here also Professor Skeat insists in his glossary upon the definite meaning "chorister." But is any reason apparent why Dame Scripture should have been at special pains to select a choir-boy as the poet's guide? Would not any young scholar have done as well?⁹

¹ "Chorknabe, kleiner Priester, auch verächtliche Bezeichnung eines Priesters."

² *Conf. Am.*, II, vs. 2850. ³ *Ibid.*, vs. 2863. ⁴ Vss. 2855, 2885. ⁵ Ed. Hearne, p. 131.

⁶ A sentence in the *Testament of Love* (*Chaucerian and Other Pieces*, p. 51, l. 62): "At masse serveth but a clergion," may at first sight seem to present an exception to this statement. The context, however, makes it clear that here, too, we have to do with a young clerk rather than a choir-boy. Usk is lamenting prevalent abuses in the church: through simony and chicanery benefices are held by unworthy persons, and as a consequence divine service suffers; young, immature clerks officiate at the mass. But surely chorister-boys are out of the question here.

⁷ Ritson, *Ancient Eng. Metr. Rom.*, Vol. II, p. 292.

⁸ A-Text, XII, vss. 49-52.

⁹ Besides, as Professor Kittredge points out to me, *Omnia-probate* is obviously the name of a cleric, not of a singing-man.

Nor do the instances of "clergeon" in Old French favor the restriction of the word to the special meaning "chorister." In Villon's *Grand Testament* (1461 A. D.) there is a bequest *a mes povres clergeons*.¹ Here, as in Ritson's *Chronicle*, this phrase suggests merely "poor scholars," and I note that P. Lacroix, in the glossary of his edition of the *Grand Testament*, defines the word simply "petit clerc."

The most extended reference to the clergeon which I have found occurs in Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme*. In the course of his moral exhortations to the several ecclesiastical orders, Gower devotes almost fifty lines to "l'estat des Clergons."² He addresses himself primarily to those among them who are looking forward to holy orders. In dwelling on their duties he holds himself provokingly aloof from explicit details which might have added greatly to our information, but he makes it clear that he is thinking of young clerks in general:

C'est doel, car du malvois enfant
Croist malvois homme, puis suiant
Du mal clergon mal prestre sourt.

And it is in this sense that Gower's editor, Mr. G. C. Macaulay, understands his use of the word; in his note on this paragraph Mr. Macaulay remarks: "The author is here dealing with young students, 'scolares.'"³

Finally, it may be noted that from the Old French *clergon* there developed a Latinized form, *clergonus*, which likewise appears to have been used in the general sense of "young clerk." Thus, *clergonus* is defined by DuCange as *junior clericus vel puer choralis*. It will be observed that the general meaning is given precedence.⁴ Moreover, there was in mediæval Latin a

¹Stanza cxxi. This reference is cited by Godefroy, who, however, does not register exactly this form of the word. His definition is as follows: "*Clergel*, -*cau*, -*cault*, *cleregaut*, petit clerc, enfant de chœur, écolier."

²Vss. 20785-832.

³If there could be any doubt as to this interpretation of the passage in the *Mirour de l'Omme*, it would be removed by comparing a parallel passage in the *Vox Clamantis* (Lib. III, cap. xxviii). For Gower, with his habitual literary thrift, has repeated the substance, and even many of the phrases, of this paragraph in his Latin work. Here he is as explicit as could be desired:

Nominē sub cleri cognouimus esse scolares,
Ecclesie plantas quos vocat ipse deus.

⁴Alongside *clergonus* the Latinization of the French form, there is also the med. Latin *clericio*. Between *clergonus* and *clericio* there is no clear distinction in meaning. DuCange

specific term, *chorista* (also spelled *corista*), which seems to have been employed wherever definite reference to choir-boys was intended, and which is met with everywhere in ecclesiastical documents.¹

To conclude, then, in both English and French "clergeon" was used in the general sense of "young clerk." It is a French diminutive² closely parallel to the Latin *clericulus*. This Latin diminutive, it is interesting to note, was frequently employed in the definite sense of "young scholar." For example, the Latin grammar of Alexander de Villa Dei, one of the famous textbooks in the grammar schools of the Middle Ages, begins:

Scribere clericulis paro doctrinale novellis.

I may refer also to a passage in the *Chronicon de Lanercost*, narrating the terrible fate which overtook some two hundred boys in the school at Hexham during Wallace's raid in 1296: "Aggregaverunt etiam turbam clericulorum in scholas de Augustaldis, et, foribus oppilatis, ignem in massam illam Deo candidam imposuerunt."³ But it is time to turn back from this quest of the word to the *Prioresses Tale* itself. For we shall find, I think, that Chaucer has decided for us beyond a doubt the question whether our clergeon was a choir-boy or not.

In the first place, the crowd of children in attendance at this "litel scole" makes it clear that it was not a school of choristers. For even in the largest churches the number of choir-boys was scarcely ever above twelve. At Bridlington, Yorkshire, in 1450, a school of grammar and song was maintained for twelve choristers;⁴ at Ottery, Devonshire, Bishop Grandisson, founding the collegiate church of St. Mary in 1361, made provision for eight

defines the latter as, "Tonsura donatus, clericulus, Gall. clerçon." *Clerçon*, according to Sainte Palaye, is simply, *diminutif du clerc*. In Gautier de Coincy's version of the story told by the Prioress *clerçons* or *clerçoncel* is the form used.

¹ Cf. *Bp. Grandisson's Register*, 1332 (ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph, Vol. II, p. 668); will of Thomas Beck, 1346 (*Testa. Eborac.*, Surtees Society, Vol. I, p. 24); *Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, 1440 (ed. Bradshaw and Wordsworth, Vol. II, p. 362); Letters of Henry VIII. for the suppression of Cardinal Wolsey's College, 1526 (Rymer's *Foedera*, ed. 1728, Vol. XIV, p. 161).

² Cf. the similar diminutive form "floroun" (*L. G. W.*, Prol. B, vs. 217).

³ *Chronicon de Lanercost*, ed. J. Stevenson, Maitland Club, 1839, p. 174; cf. also Prynne's *Collections*, Vol. III, p. 542.

⁴ *Rotul. Parl.*, Vol. V, p. 188.

choir-boys;¹ at Higham Ferrers, in the collegiate church founded by Archbishop Chichele in 1422, there were only six choir-boys;² at the Hospital of Holy Cross, Winchester, there were seven;³ and at the collegiate church of Holy Trinity, Stratford-on-Avon, there were but four.⁴

Even in the great cathedral churches the number of choir-boys was never large. At Lincoln in 1264, according to the statutes of Bishop Gravesend, there were only twelve;⁵ and in 1440 their number had not been increased.⁶ At Salisbury, which was distinguished throughout England for the elaborateness of its ritual, the number of choristers was fourteen.⁷ When we place beside these meager numbers the description of Chaucer's school, "in which ther were children an heep," the difference is obvious.

Finally, it may be pointed out that in the fourteenth-century choir-boys were kept under a discipline which nowhere appears in the *Prioresses Tale*. They lived together under the watchful eye of one of the clergy, in quarters provided for them within the church inclosure. They were not allowed to walk outside the grounds of the church, except two by two, and then only when accompanied by a guardian. Let us take the cathedral church at Lincoln as an example: In the statutes drawn up by Bishop Gravesend in 1264 we read:

Ordinacio puerorum de choro ecclesie Lincoln.

1. quod dicti pueri forent duodecim numero et de illis duodecim forent duo turribularii, et in una domo manerent et viverent communiter sub uno Magistro.⁸

In the revised statutes of 1440 further details are added:

De statu choristarum.

. . . ordinamus, statutum imitantes bone memorie Ricardi Graveshende, ut duodecim choriste in domibus in clauso ad hoc constitutis simul

¹ Bp. Grandisson's Register, ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph, Vol. II, p. 1228.

² John Bridge, *Hist. and Antiq. of Northamptonshire*, 1791, Vol. II, pp. 177, 178.

³ Warren, *St. Cross*, 1899.

⁴ Dugdale, *Antiq. of Warwickshire*, Vol. II, p. 692.

⁵ *Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, ed. Bradshaw and Wordsworth, Part II, p. 162.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 362.

⁷ *Parlia. Papers*, 1867-68, XXVIII, Report Schools Inq. Com., Vol. XIV, p. 36.

⁸ *Lincoln Cath. Stat.*, Vol. II, p. 162.

vivant, sub perpetua custodia alicujus canonici residentis in ecclesia nostra. . . . Quociens vero supradicti pueri ad spaciatum vel solacium ire debent, pariter erunt et redeant sub ducatu alicujus maturi hominis ad hoc per custodem vel supervisorem assignati; nec puerili levitate sparsum evagentur inhoneste.¹

Similar statutes existed at St. Paul's, London, at Wells, and doubtless in many other places. At Wells the directions as to the sleeping arrangements of the choristers are interesting; they were to sleep three in a bed, two younger lads ranged at either side of the bed, and between them an older boy lying with his head toward the foot-board.² Nor was this rigid discipline confined to the cathedral churches. With the numerous services which were held daily in the mediæval churches, it was a matter of no small importance that the boys of the choir should be on hand at the appointed hour. And experience no doubt had taught that to be sure of having your boy when you want him the best way is to keep him well in sight. The following regulations for the government of the four choir-boys at Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-on-Avon, were drawn up by the warden, Ralph Collingwood, in 1491. The quaintness of these rules makes it impossible for me to refrain from a somewhat lengthy quotation:

Which Choristers, by his said Ordination, should always come by two and two together into the Quire to Mattens and Vespers, on such days as the same were to be sung there, according to the Ordinale Sarum; and at their entrance into the Church, bowing their knees before the Crucifix, each of them say a Pater noster and an Ave.

And for their better regulation did he order and appoint; that they should sit quietly in the Quire, saying the Mattens and Vespers of our Lady distinctly, and afterwards be observant to the Offices of the Quire: that they should not be sent upon any occasion whatsoever into the town: that at Dinner and Supper times they should constantly be in the Colledge to wait at the Table: and to read upon the Bible or some other authentique book: that they should not come into the Buttry to draw beer for themselves or anybody else: that after Dinner they should go to the singing School: and that their Schoolmaster should be one of the Priests or Clerks appointed by the discretion of the Warden, being a man able to instruct them in singing to the Organ: as also that they should have one

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 362.

² Statutes of 1459, in H. E. Reynolds, *Wells Cathedral, Its Hist. and Statutes*, 1881, pp. clxxxii-v.

Bed-chamber in the church, whereunto they were to repair in Winter time at 8 of the Clock, and in Summer at nine; in which lodging to be two Beds, wherein they were to sleep by couples; and that before they did put off their clothes they should all say the prayer of De Profundis with a loud voyce, with the prayers and orisons of the faithfull; and afterwards say thus, God have mercy of the soule of Rauf Colyngwode our Founder and Master Thomas Balshall a speciall benefactor to the same.¹

Such was the daily life of the choir-boy. Our clergeon was none of these. The boys in Chaucer's school were day-scholars, coming to the school in the morning and returning to their homes at night. The school was not held in a church "close," nor is anything said to indicate that it was in any way connected with a church.

II

But if this was not a school of choristers, how does it happen that they were singing anthems? This question is easily answered when one understands that the fundamental purpose of the mediæval school was to train children for participation in the services of the church; for in these services music played an important part. Accordingly, instruction in singing was given, not only to the boys serving in the choir, or to those who were being educated for the priesthood, but also to the youth of the parish generally. An extract from the injunctions of Bishop Pontissera at the Diocesan Synod of Winchester in 1295 will make this clear.

Let rectors, vicars and parish priests see that the boys of their parishioners know the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and Angelic Salutation of the Virgin, and to sign themselves rightly with the sign of the cross; *and the parents of boys should be induced to let their boys, after they know how to read the psalter, learn singing also; lest by chance after they have learned higher subjects they should be obliged to go back to this, or being ignorant of it, should be always less fit for divine service.*²

This injunction, it will be observed, does not specify any particular class, but relates to the children of parishioners in general.

The obligation to train up the laity to bear their part in the church worship by instructing them as children in matters pertaining to the liturgy, was repeatedly emphasized in the papal

¹ Dugdale, *Antiq. of Warwickshire*, pp. 692, 693.

² A. F. Leach, *Hist. of Winchester Coll.*, 1900, p. 40. The italics are mine.

decretals. Thus in a decretal of Gregory IX (1227-41) it is enjoined—

That every priest who rules a congregation shall have a clerk who shall sing with him and read the Epistle and the Lesson, and who shall be able to keep a school, and shall admonish the parishioners to send their boys to the church to be taught in the faith, whom he shall instruct with all purity.

A marginal gloss in the edition of 1498 summarizes this injunction briefly: "Scolas: docendo pueros Psalterium et cantare."¹

It need give us no surprise, therefore, to find schoolboys learning song. Indeed, as I shall show later, the singing of anthems is mentioned more than once as a part of the prescribed exercises in the grammar schools of the fourteenth century. But first let us inquire particularly in regard to the anthem to which Chaucer refers—the *Alma Redemptoris*.

Professor Skeat at first² believed that the hymn referred to in the *Prioresses Tale* was that beginning:

Alma redemptoris mater,
quam de coelis misit pater.³

But in a later note⁴ he gives up this hymn in favor of the anthem in the *Roman Breviary* which begins:

Alma redemptoris mater, quae peruia caeli.⁵

No one will question the correctness of this later opinion. But unfortunately in his note on the *Alma Redemptoris*, these two hymns are inextricably confused. Of the former hymn, taken from Mone, he says: "The first and last stanzas were sung in the Marian Antiphon, from the Saturday evening before the first Sunday in Advent to Candlemas Day." Then, speaking of the anthem in the *Roman Breviary*, he tells us that it "was said at

¹ *Greg. IX Decretales*, ed. Baptista de Tortis, Venice, 1498, p. 157 dors. This injunction did not originate with Pope Gregory; it is verbally identical with a canon of Bishop Burchardus of Worms (1000-1025 A. D.) quoted by Specht (*Gesch. des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschl.*, p. 39, n. 1).

² *Oxford Chaucer*, Vol. V, p. 177.

³ F. J. Mono, *Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters*, ed. 1856, Vol. II, p. 200; also printed by Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnolog.*, ed. 1856, Vol. V, p. 133.

⁴ *Oxford Chaucer*, Vol. III, p. 422. Clearly written later than the note in Vol. V.

⁵ *Rom. Breviary*, ed. 1583, p. 112; also in *Breviarium ad usum Sarum*, ed. Procter and Wordsworth, Fasciculus III, p. 783; the *York Breviary*, ed. S. W. Lawley, *Surtees Society*, Vol. II, p. 494; and in Daniel, *Thes. Hymnolog.*, Vol. II, p. 318.

compline from Advent eve to Candlemas day, like the other."¹ Surely a strange procedure to assign two anthems beginning with the same line to exactly the same place in the ritual of the church!

On turning to the pages of Mone, one finds that the difficulty into which Professor Skeat leads us is due to a misunderstanding. Mone says:

Der erste und letzte Vers dieses Liedes ist der Anfang und Schluss der Marianischen Antiphone, welche von der Vesper des Samstags vor dem ersten Adventssonntag bis zu Mariä Lichtmesse gesungen wird, also eine Uebersetzung des Kirchenliedes.

Vers of course cannot be translated "stanza," for which Mone invariably uses the word *Strophe*. Mone, in this sentence, merely calls attention to the fact that the first and last *lines* of the hymn which he prints are identical with the beginning and ending of the Marian antiphon (i. e., the one in the *Breviary*), and argues from this that his hymn is to be regarded as founded upon the older one in the *Breviary*. His meaning is unmistakable when one notes that the first and last lines of Mone's hymn are printed in italics. Furthermore, the title of the hymn in Mone's collection is not "*Antiphone beatae Mariae*," but instead "*Sequentia de beata Virgine*." It is clear, therefore, that Mone intends expressly to distinguish the hymn which he prints from the Marian antiphon with this beginning, and to identify the latter with the *Alma Redemptoris* of the *Breviary*.²

The *Alma Redemptoris* of the *Breviary*, then, is the only one which can be properly referred to as a Marian antiphon. This is important, for it enables us to identify references to this antiphon about which we should otherwise be in doubt.

In point of popularity few mediaeval anthems surpassed this one sung by our clergeon. "Diese Antiphon," testifies Rambach, "gehört zu den vier in der katholischen Christenheit noch jetzt

¹ Oxford Chaucer, Vol. V, p. 177.

² If further proof were needed on this point, it would be supplied by examining Mone's notes on other hymns in his collection. Coming upon the phrases *sumens illud ave*, *Gabrielis ore* (Vol. II, pp. 217, 227), and *succurre cadenti* (II, p. 328), he points out that they have been borrowed from "the antiphon *Alma Redemptoris*." Inasmuch as these phrases occur only in the *Breviary* anthem, there can be no doubt to which *Alma Redemptoris* Mone applied this title.

allgemein gesungenen, und beliebten Antiphonen."¹ In two of the analogues of the *Prioresses Tale* (The Paris Beggar-Boy and Alfonsus of Lincoln) the *Alma Redemptoris* is expressly mentioned as the anthem sung by the young martyr. Also pointing toward the popularity of this hymn, is a bequest in the will of Robert Appleby, dated 1407, by which a yearly stipend is left to the Clerks' Guild at Lincoln so long as they should continue to sing the anthem *Alma Redemptoris* and pray for his soul.² In the two great breviaries of English liturgy—Sarum and York—this antiphon finds a regular place, as well as in other less influential rituals. And, finally, it is one of the mediæval hymns which was selected by Cardinal Newman for translation into English.³

As to the place of our anthem in the calendar of services, there seems to have been no general agreement. The *Roman Breviary*, as Professor Skeat has pointed out, provides for the singing of the *Alma Redemptoris* at compline from Advent eve to Candlemas Day. In the *Sarum Breviary* this anthem is twice mentioned. The first reference occurs in the order of services for the second Sunday after Easter:

Ad Vesperas—Hae sequentes Antiphonae dicuntur usque ad Ascensionem Domini, quando in introitu chori dicetur de sancta Maria, scilicet, Ant. Alma Redemptoris, etc.⁴

The other mention of this anthem occurs at the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (September 8):

Ad Secundas Vesperas—Hae sequentes Antiphonae dicuntur *ad Processionem* in redeundo, per Aestatem,⁵ quando de Sancta Maria

¹ *Anthologie christlicher Gesänge aus allen Jahrh. der Kirche*, Hammerich, 1817, quoted by Daniel, Vol. II, p. 318.

² *Early Lincoln Wills*, ed. A. Gibbons, p. 107.

³ "Kindly Mother of the Redeemer," *Tracts for the Times*, No. 75, 1836.

⁴ *Breviarium ad usum Sarum*, ed. F. Procter and Chr. Wordsworth, 1879-86, Fasciculus I, p. decccci.

⁵ *Aestas*, as here used, does not refer to the three-month season of summer. Instead of dividing the year into four seasons, as did the *Roman Breviary*, the breviaries of England split the year into halves: *Pars Hyemalis* and *Pars Estivalis*. The former extended—roughly speaking—from November to May; the latter from May to November (cf. *Old Service-Books of English Church*, Wordsworth and Littlehales, 1904, p. 98). The present reference, then, seems to mean that the anthems mentioned were to be sung from the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin (September 8) until the close of the summer division.

dicatur Antiphona in introitu chori, nisi inter Octavas Assumptionis et Nativitatis beatæ Mariæ (August 22 to September 15):

Ant. 1. Ave regina.

Ant. 2. Alma Redemptoris mater quæ peruia caeli.¹

Somewhat different from these rules of the *Sarum Breviary* are the directions found in the *Crede Michi*, a fifteenth-century book compiled to assist the priests in finding their way through the labyrinth of services and feasts. In the *Crede Michi* the *Alma Redemptoris* is mentioned as one of the four antiphons to be sung from the Feast of the Holy Trinity (June 16) to Advent, "alternatim tam ad vespervas quam ante missam."² Once again our anthem is referred to in the *Crede Michi*, this time in connection with the services of Paschal Week.³

In the *York Breviary*, on the other hand, there is but slight mention of the *Alma Redemptoris*. The only reference which I find occurs in the services for the octave of the Assumption of the Virgin (August 22). Here it is directed that the anthem (which is given entire) shall be sung at vespers on the sixth day of this octave.⁴ In the book of offices of the Briggittine monastery of Sion, to which Professor Skeat has already called attention, the *Alma Redemptoris*, instead of being assigned to the services of any special season, was sung every Sunday throughout the year, at the close of compline, the last service of the day.⁵

In view of these conflicting usages, it is useless to undertake to determine the season of the year at which the events of the *Prioresses Tale* occurred by referring to the service-books. Moreover, the times at which this anthem was sung in the church

¹ The anthem is given in full, *Sarum Brev.*, Fasciculus III, p. 783.

² *The Tracts of Clement Maydeston*, ed. Chr. Wordsworth, Bradshaw Society, 1894, p. 66. The *Crede Michi* is ascribed to Clement Maydeston (†1456), but Wordsworth shows that the portions with which we are here concerned are the work of John Raynton, circa 1450-55 (pp. xxxv-vii).

³ "*Verus ordo Antiphonarum de Sancta Maria*

In hebdomada Pasce prima ant. *Alma Redemptoris mater*.

Secunda (*Ave regina*).

Tercia *Anima mea*.

Quarta *Beata Dei genetriz*.

Quinta Ant. *Descendi*.

Sexta Ant. *Speciosa*."—*Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁴ *York Breviary*, ed. S. W. Lawley, Surtees Society, 1882, Vol. II, p. 494. This is a reprint of an edition of 1493, printed at Venice.

⁵ *Myroure of Oure Ladye*, ed. J. H. Blunt, E. E. T. S., 1873, p. 174.

service really have nothing to do with the case. These scholars, as I have shown, were not choir-boys; consequently this was not a choir rehearsal, and the time of singing the anthem would not be governed by the liturgies. This opinion is confirmed by finding in the statutes of mediæval grammar schools express provision for the singing of a Marian antiphon among the prescribed school exercises. Thus at Wells, in a charter of the cathedral grammar school (not the choristers' school), dated about 1235, it is directed that every Wednesday and Friday morning the scholars on coming to school shall sing an antiphon in honor of the Blessed Virgin.¹ In the statutes of the Stratford-on-Avon grammar school—the school which Shakspeare doubtless attended in his day—which were drawn up in 1482, there is a similar provision:

Et in super predictus dominus Willelmus clerico, et prefatus grammaticalis et scolares sui bis in septimana, videlicet in die Mercurii et in die veneris cantabunt antiphonam de Sancta Maria.²

Wednesday and Friday, the "Stationary days" as they were called,³ were especially observed by the pious. This doubtless explains the special religious exercises on these days in many grammar schools.⁴

Marian antiphons, then, are mentioned in the statutes of grammar schools as part of the regular school exercises.⁵ In this fact we have a sufficient explanation of the singing of the *Alma Redemptoris* in Chaucer's school.

¹ *Histor. MSS Commission, Report X, Part 3, p. 19.*

² *Collectanea Topograph. et Genealogica*, 1836, Vol. III, p. 82.

³ Cf. Chr. Wordsworth, *St. Nicholas Hospital, Salisbury*, p. lxii, note.

⁴ Thus the founder of the chantry grammar school at Stockport (1487) ordained: "I woll that the same connyng Preest with all his scolers with hym, that he shall have for the time, shall two dayes in ev'ry weke as long as he shall abyde in that s'vice ther, that is to wite Wednysday and Fryday, come into the said Church of Stopforde unto the grave ther where the bodies of my Fader and Moder lyen buried, and ther say togidres the psalme of de profundis with the versucles and collette thereto accustomed after Salisbury use." (*Heg-inbotham, Stockport Ancient and Modern*, Vol. II, p. 371.)

⁵ Another instance of the singing of a Marian antiphon may be mentioned, though in this case the school was of a somewhat different type. In 1515 an agreement was entered into between St. Peter's Abbey, Gloucester, and one John Tucke, employed to teach grammar to the novices of the monastery and thirteen boys of "the clerks of the chamber," and also to teach song to five or six apt and teachable boys. In this agreement it is prescribed that Master Tucke, "cum eisdem pueris missam Beatae Mariae Virginis unacum antiphona ejusdem quotidie, ac sextis feriis missam de nomine Jesu cum antiphona ejusdem devote servabit." (*Histor. et Cartular. Monast. Gloucestr.*, Rolls Series, Vol. III, p. 291.)

III

Let us proceed next to ask what the boys in this fourteenth-century school were studying. So far as the clergeon himself is concerned, Chaucer's answer is explicit: he "sat in the scole at his prymer." The clergeon, in all probability, was in his first year at school, for he was "seuen yeer of age;" and this was the very age at which boys in Chaucer's time usually began going to school.¹ The "prymer," then, we may infer, was the book with which a boy's education began.

What was this "prymer"? Professor Skeat—in consideration, perhaps, of the fact that our scholar "so yong and tendre was of age"—defines it in his glossary as an "elementary reading book." This definition, however, hardly does justice to the contents of the mediæval primer; it suggests too strongly the short words and easy sentences of the "first readers" of our own day. The character of this primer is more clearly indicated in a passage in *Piers Plowman*. The author of this poem was certainly no child, yet he tells us:

The lomes that ich laboure with and lyfode deserue
Ys *pater noster* and my prymer, *placebo* and *dirige*,
And my sauter som tyme and my seune psalmes,
Thus ich synge for hure soules of such as me helpen.²

Here Professor Skeat defines "prymer" as "a book of elementary religious instruction." This is nearer the mark. But why "elementary"? Langland did not mean us to understand from this that he went about instructing children. Rather, he sought employment in singing for souls after the fashion of chantry priests.

The prymer, in short, was not, as its name might suggest, a book especially designed for children, but was a prayer-book for the use of young and old alike. Historically, the prymer seems to have been a development from the psalter, to which prayers and devotional exercises had gradually been added. At length,

¹ Thus in 1340 Bishop Burgershe, of Lincoln, left an endowment to support six boys at grammar school from the age of seven to fifteen (Chr. Wordsworth, article on "Lincolnshire Chantries," *Northern Genealogist*, 1895, p. 152). Richard II in 1398 made a grant to the Carthusian Priory at Coventry for the maintenance of twelve poor clerks from the age of seven to seventeen (Dugdale's *Monasticon*, Vol. VI, p. 18).

² C-Text, VI, vss. 45-48.

during the thirteenth century¹ these were separated from the psalter and gathered into a separate book according to a fixed order.² The contents of a prymer invariably include: the "Hours of the Blessed Virgin," the "Seven Penitential Psalms," the "Fifteen Gradual Psalms," the "Litany," the "Office for the Dead," and "Commendations."³ In addition to these essentials, many copies of the prymer contain other devotions and pieces of religious instruction.

At first, of course, the prymers were in Latin. These Latin prymers also frequently went under the title *Horae Beatae Mariae Virginis*, from the fact that they began with the "Hours of the Virgin."⁴ At length, during the last quarter of the fourteenth century, prymers in English began to appear, and in this form speedily attained great popularity as the prayer-book of the laity. From this time to the Reformation the prymer circulated

¹ The earliest mention of a prymer yet discovered is dated 1297. The reference is given by Mr. Littlehales in his "Notes on the Primer" (E. E. T. S., No. 109, Part II, p. 2). It occurs in the inventory of the property of an Essex church made on the occasion of a visitation: "Erdele (Ardley, Yerdley) Item vnum primarium cum septem psalmis, et XV, et Placebo et Dirige" (*Visitations of Churches Belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral*, Camden Society, pp. 49, 50).

² Cf. the scholarly essay on "The Origin of the Prymer," by Edmund Bishop, in *The Prymer or Lay Folks' Prayer-Book* (E. E. T. S.), Part II, 1897, pp. xi-xxxviii; also see Edgar Hoskins, *Horae B. M. Virginis, or Sarum and York Primers*, etc., 1901.

³ Three early manuscript prymers in English have already been edited: Brit. Museum MS No. 17010, of about the year 1410 (ed. William Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, 1846, Vol. III); St. John's Coll. Camb. MS G 24, before 1400 (ed. Henry Littlehales, *The Prymer or Prayer-Book of the Lay People in the Middle Ages*, Longmans, Green & Co., 1891-92); Camb. Univ. MS Dd. 11, 82, between 1420 and 1430 (ed. Littlehales, E. E. T. S., 1895-97). Valuable introductions and collations of some fifteen other MSS accompany the texts. Mr. Littlehales' most recent discussion of the prymer will be found in Wordsworth and Littlehales, *Old English Service-Books of the English Church*, 1904, chap. ix.

The printed editions of the prymer, both Latin and English, of the early sixteenth century, have been made the subject of a valuable monograph by Rev. Edgar Hoskins: *Horae B. Mariae Virginis, or Sarum and York Primers with Kindred Books*, etc. (Longmans, Green & Co., 1901).

⁴ It is contended by Maskell that the term "prymer" was applied only to the English versions. "The Latin editions of the 'horae,'" he says, "do not use in any way the term Prymer. Their titles usually run, 'Horae beatae Mariae virginis ad usum ecclesiae Sarum,' or 'Horae presentes ad usum Sarum impressae fuerunt,' etc., although they contain not only the hours, but various other offices, the penitential psalms, dirge, etc.," (*Monumenta Rit. Eccl. Anglic.*, 2d. ed. 1882, Vol. III, p. xxxv.) He appears to contradict this statement, however, in his note on p. lx: "In the Latin books the names orarium, horae, prymer, and enchiridion are sometimes used interchangeably." Mr. Littlehales holds—rightly, it seems to me—that the title "prymer" was used of the Latin as well as of the English versions: "That the name is also properly applied to the book, whether the contents be in English, Latin or in both languages, we may also feel sure from the reason that the name is applied indiscriminately to all three varieties." (*Old Eng. Service-Books*, p. 248.)

both in Latin and in English, as well as with the Latin and the English text side by side.

With these general facts in mind, let us turn to the matter of particular interest to us at present—the use of the prymer in the schools. It is strange that, much as has been written in recent years concerning the prymer, the fact has never been clearly recognized that it was in ordinary use as a school textbook.¹ Nevertheless, there is abundant historical evidence—besides the explicit statement of Chaucer—to establish the fact of such use.

Perhaps it will be well to turn first to the evidence in the sixteenth century, at the time when Roman Catholic prayers were being superseded by the revised ritual of the Reformers. Henry VIII made it one of his first cares, after the separation from the Roman church, to prepare a revision of the prymer, both in Latin and in English, commanding that his prymer should everywhere be used instead of the earlier form. These decrees in regard to the prymer were confirmed in 1547 by Edward VI, among whose injunctions we find the following: "And that no teacher of youth shall teach any other than the said primer."² It is clear from this that the prymer held a recognized place in the instruction of the schools. Still more valuable testimony to the actual use of the prymer as a school-book is found in the *Day-Book of John Dorne*,³ the Oxford bookseller, in which are entered the titles of the books which he had in stock in 1520. In this list I count no less than twenty-six entries of *primarium pro pueris*.

But the fact that we find special "boys' primers" raises the question whether the primers used in the schools may not have differed materially from the regular editions. In answer to

¹ Once indeed Mr. Littlehales, in his "Notes on the Prymer" (*The Prymer*, E. E. T. S., No. 100, Part II, p. 3), suggests the possibility that schoolboys occasionally studied the prymer. "Is it possible," he asks, "that service books and primers were at times used as books from which children and choristers were sometimes taught?" He then proceeds to cite, in support of this suggestion, the reference to the prymer in the *Prioresses Tale*, but carries the matter no farther. Mr. H. E. Nolloth, in his introduction to the *Lay Folks' Catechism* (E. E. T. S., 1901, p. xxxv), comes somewhat nearer in his statement that "during the 15th century, children were commonly taught the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments without any explanation, and with the addition of the *Ave Maria* and other prayers to the saints." But the only prymer whose use in the schools he recognizes is the revised primer of the Reformers.

² Edw. Cardwell, *Doc. Annals of the Reformed Church of England*, 1839, Vol. I, p. 20; cf. also p. 49.

³ *Collectanea*, ed. C. R. L. Fletcher, Oxford Hist. Society, 1885, Vol. I.

this question it may be asserted, in the first place, that there is no evidence that these boys' prymer were abridgments. The price at which they were entered (ranging from 4*d.* to 6*d.*), though not large, is the same as that of the regular editions. Moreover, one comes upon the entry of a *primarium pro pueris longum*. These "long prymer" were editions which contained a number of additional prayers and offices not found in the ordinary edition.¹ Even these, it would appear, were sometimes used by boys. Plainly, then, the distinction between "boys' prymer" and the ordinary sort did not consist in abridgment.

In what respects, then, did they differ? I am disposed to believe that a boys' prymer was merely the ordinary prymer with certain elementary matters prefixed for the convenience of school-boys. A good example of a prymer of this sort is one printed in 1537, with the title: *The Primer in english for children after the use of Sarum*.² At the beginning one finds the "Alphabet," "Lord's Prayer," "Salutation," "Apostles' Creed," "Ten Commandments," "Graces" (before and after dinner, and before and after supper), the psalm "De Profundis," and the "Works of Mercy." Then follow the prayers as in the ordinary prymer, except that the "Fifteen Gradual Psalms," the "Offices for the Dead," and the "Commendations" are omitted. In some of the early manuscript prymer in English one finds similar elementary material prefixed. Thus at the beginning of a manuscript of the time of Richard II are placed the "Alphabet," the "Lord's Prayer," "Hail Mary," "Apostles' Creed," "A Confession," "Graces" for particular occasions, the "Seven Sacraments," and the "Easter Table." Then follows the prymer proper, in full, and at the end of this, the "Ten Commandments," the "Seven Deadly Sins," the "Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost," the "Seven Words of Christ," and the "Sixteen Properties of Charity."³ Essentially the same additions are also found in a number of the Latin prymer collated by Mr. Hoskins.

¹ Probably the MS prymer, Brit. Mus. Nos. 17010 and 17011, and Ashmol. 1288, may be taken as fair examples of the long prymer. See the collation of their contents in *Littlehales' Prymer*, Part II.

² Hoskins, *Horae beatae Mariae*, p. 173.

³ Hunterian Library MS V 6, 22, collated by Littlehales, *The Prymer*, Part II, p. 10.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century this elementary material which is found prefixed to many of the prymer was also printed separately—probably on a single sheet—with the title “The ABC.” In John Dorne’s *Day-Book* a quantity of these ABC’s are entered—in *papiro* at 1d. apiece, in *pergameno* at two-pence. Never, however, is this ABC confused with the prymer—another reason for believing that the *primarium pro pueris*, contained something beside this elementary instruction. The following list of the contents of an ABC printed by Thomas Petit about 1538, is given by Henry Bradshaw: “Pater Noster, Ave Maria, Credo (in Latin and English), Ten Commandments, Graces before and after meals as in the Sarum Manual, Parts of the Service requisite to enable a child to serve at mass.”¹ In the early sixteenth century this ABC was used in some of the more elementary schools of England. So at Launceston the chantry commissioners of Henry VIII reported the existence of a school “to teache yonge chylderne the ABC.”² I have not found evidence, however, of the existence of the ABC in separate form before the beginning of the sixteenth century.

That the prymer was used in the schools of the early sixteenth century is, as we have seen, abundantly established; let us turn back now to the time of Chaucer. A circular letter sent out in 1356 by Bishop Grandisson, of Exeter, to the schoolmasters of his diocese affords valuable testimony on the subject of our present inquiry. In this letter the bishop declares that he has been moved to amazement and pity by some of the methods of instruction which he has observed in the grammar schools of his diocese. These methods, he says, are absurd, unprofitable, yes, even superstitious, more after the fashion of heathen than of Christians. What were the methods to which the bishop takes exception? Let him answer in his own words:

Dum ipsi scolares suos, postquam Oracionem Dominicam cum Salutatione Angelica, et Symbolum, necnon Matutinas et Horas Beate Virginis, et similia que ad Fidem pertinent et anime salutem, legere aut

¹ *Collected Papers of Henry Bradshaw*, 1889, pp. 333-40. Cf. also the elementary portion of an English prymer of 1537 (Hoskins, *Horae B. Mariae*, p. 173), which is entitled “The ABC.” An edition of the ABC in Latin was printed by Thomas Berthelet in 1543, with the title *Alphabetum Latino Anglicum*. (J. T. Ames, *Typograph. Antiq.*, ed. 1749, p. 173.)

² A. F. Leach, *English Schools at the Reformation*, Part II, p. 34; cf. also p. 31.

dicere eciam minus perfecte didicerint, absque eo quod quicquam de predictis construere sciant vel intelligere, aut dicciones ibi declinare vel respondere de partibus earundem, ad alios libros magistrales et poeticos aut metricos ad[d]iscendos transire faciunt premature. Unde contigit quod in etate adulta, cotidiana que dicunt aut legunt non intelligant; Fidem eciam, Catholicam (quod dampnabilius est) propter defectum intelligencie non agnoscant.

This state of affairs the bishop will not allow to continue; he therefore closes his letter with the following express injunction to these schoolmasters:

Injungimus et mandamus, quatinus pueros, quos recipiunt in Grammaticalibus imbuendos, non tantum legere aut discere literaliter, ut hactenus, set, aliis omnibus omissis, construere et intelligere faciant Oracionem Dominicam, cum Salutatione Angelica, Symbolum, et Matutinas, ac Horas de Beata Virgine, et dicciones ibi declinare ac respondere de partibus earundem, antequam eosdem ad alios libros transire permittant.¹

There can, of course, be no doubt that the bishop is here referring to the prymer. The "Hours of the Blessed Virgin" invariably formed a part of the contents of the prymer. Indeed, as we have seen, *Horae de Beata Virgine* was the very title by which the Latin primers were frequently known. As for the Lord's Prayer, the Angelic Salutation, and the Creed, these are pieces of religious instruction often prefixed to the primers, especially those intended for the use of boys.

But beyond the testimony which it affords to the use of the prymer in the schools, the bishop's letter has further interest for us. It shows us the way in which the prymer was studied. The boys first learned these devotions by rote (*literaliter*). Then, as they progressed in their knowledge of grammar, they were taught to construe these Latin prayers. For, it will be observed, the bishop offers no objection to the committing of the prymer to memory, but only to the fact that boys were allowed to go on to other books before they had parsed and declined the Latin of the prymer.

The bishop, moreover, has cleared up for us the question whether the prymer which our clergeon was studying was in Latin or in English. One might at first be inclined to doubt whether

¹ Bp. Grandisson's Register, ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph, Vol. II, pp. 1192, 1193.

a Latin prymer would have been put into the hands of a little lad in his first year at school. But after all there is nothing incredible in this; as soon as he had learned his alphabet (which was probably on the first page of his prymer), he could at once begin spelling out the words of his Pater Noster and committing them to memory. He might not understand them, it is true—that would depend on whether the master took pains to explain their meaning to him as he went along—but at all events he could repeat them, and that was in those days the first essential.

For, as I have already said, one of the primary objects in the school of the fourteenth century was to train children for participation in the liturgy of the church, and that liturgy was in the Latin tongue. Even laymen in the Middle Ages learned in Latin at least the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ave, though in most cases they probably did not understand the meaning of the words they were reciting.¹ Parish priests were enjoined by the bishops to examine parishioners as to their knowledge of these forms,² and there is record of penalties imposed upon those who failed to pass this examination satisfactorily.³

¹ Thus Bishop Grosteste, in his homily *De Orando*, maintained that laymen derive spiritual benefit from repeating their Pater Noster with worshipful hearts, *although they do not understand the meaning of the words they utter* (Brown's *Fasciculus* II, p. 284). In this connection, Professor Kittredge reminds me of the "Mery Geste How the Plowman Lerne'd his Pater Noster" (*Remains of Early Pop. Poetry of England*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt, 1864, Vol. I, p. 209). This story of the ingenious device by which a priest taught the Pater Noster to an illiterate parishioner, though not found in English earlier than the print by Wynkyn de Worde, was related in Italian prose in 1424, and occurs also in a Latin version of the second half of the fifteenth century (cf. R. Kohler, *Anglia*, Vol. II, pp. 388 ff.).

² The bishops' "Constitutions" of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries abound in injunctions to this effect. Thus in 1255, Bishop Kirkham, of Durham: "Habeat quoque unusquisque eorum [i. e. sacerdotes parochiales] simplicem intellectum fidei, sicut in symbolo, tam majori quam minori, quod est in psalmo *Quicumque vult et etiam Credo in Deum* expressius continentur: necnon in oratione dominica, quae dicitur *Pater Noster*, ac salutatione beatae Mariae, et qualiter se debeant crucis characterem insignire; ne cum laici super hoc requisiti fuerint, se conficte valeant excusare occasione negligentiae sacerdotum." (Wilkins, *Concilia*, I, p. 704.)

In the synodal statutes of Norwich, 1257: "Provideant attentius ecclesiarum rectores, et sacerdotes parochiales, ut pueri parochiarum suarum diligenter doceantur, ut sciant dominicam orationem, et symbolum, et salutationem beatae virginis, et crucis signacula sibi recte consignare." (*Ibid.*, I, p. 732.)

Cf. Also the injunctions of Bishop Pontissara, diocesan synod of Winchester, 1295 (Leach, *Hist. of Winchester Coll.*, 1900, p. 40); and the statutes of Archbishop Thoresby, of York, in 1351 (*Lay Folks' Catechism*, E. E. T. S., at bottom of pp. 6, 20, and 22); also "Dan Jon Gaytryge's Sermon" (*Relig. Pieces in Prose and Verse*, E. E. T. S., pp. 2 and 13).

³ For example, the following presentment was made in a visitation of the diocese of London in 1497: "Willielmus Nicholl notatur officio quod male sapit de fide, quia raro accedit ad ecclesiam suam parochialem. Et cum veniret, nullas preces Deo fundit, et

Toward the close of the fourteenth century, it is true, English versions of the prymer and of other books of religious instruction began to appear¹—probably due in large measure to the influence of Wyclif. But these books in the vernacular were designed to make the Latin liturgies intelligible, not to displace them.² Indeed, in the English primers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the Latin text was frequently placed beside the English translation. So far as the schools are concerned, it is not until the sixteenth century that one finds any evidence that the boys were being taught their prymer in English.³

IV

Our study of the school which the clergeon attended has thus far been confined to an exposition of the *Alma Redemptoris* and the "prymer." It remains to inquire what other instruction was being given there. Does Chaucer's description of this school allow us to regard it as a "grammar school"—a type well known in the Middle Ages—or was it purely an elementary school

creditor, quod nescit orationem Dominicam, salutionem angelicam, neque symbolum apostolorum. . . . habet ad purgandum se vij Marcii." (Maskell, *Mon. Rit.*, III, p. liii.)

¹ Examples of such books are the *Lay Folks' Mass-Book* (ed. T. F. Simmons, E. E. T. S., 1879; cf. also G. H. Gerould, *Engl. Studien*, Vol. XXXIII, pp. 1-27, and Balbrin, *Engl. Stud.*, XXXV, pp. 28-33) and the *Lay Folks' Catechism* (ed. Simmons and Nolloth, E. E. T. S., 1901).

² The reluctance to discard Latin in private devotions, even on the part of those who were friendly disposed toward prayer-books in the vernacular, is well illustrated in the following passage from *The Chastyng of Goddes Chyldren*, a treatise printed by Caxton, probably about 1483 (cf. Dibdin's *Typograph. Antiq.*, Vol. I, p. 356): "Some now in these dayes use to say in englissh her sawter & matynes of our lady, ye vij psalmes & the letanye. Many repreue it to have the sawter matynes or the gospel or the byble in englissh by cause they may not be translated into no vulgare worde by worde as it stondest without grete circumlocucion after the feling of the firste wryters whiche translated that into latyn by techyng of ye holi goost. Neuertheles I wyll not repreue to have hem in englissh ne to rede on hem when they may stire you more to deuocyon & to the lone of god. But unterli to use hem in englissh & leue the latyn I holde it not commendable." (J. T. Ames, *Typograph. Antiq.*, ed. 1790, Vol. I, p. 102.)

³ Even as late as the sixteenth century schoolboys were still being taught the Credo, Pater Noster, etc., in Latin. Thus according to the statutes of the chantry school at Childrey-near-Wantage, founded in 1526, the priest was bound to "teach the children the Alphabet, the Lord's Prayer, the Salutation of the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles' Creed, and all other things which are necessary to enable them to assist the Priest in the celebration of the Mass, together with the psalm 'De Profundis' and the usual prayers for the dead. Also he shall teach them to say Grace as well at dinner as at supper." Then it is added, as if in distinction to what has gone before: "Likewise he shall teach them in English the Fourteen Articles of the Faith, the Ten Commandments, the Seven Deadly Sins, the Seven Sacraments of the Church, the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Seven Works of Mercy as well corporal as spiritual, the Five Bodily Senses, and the manner of Confession." (N. Carlisle, *Endowed Gram. Schools of England*, Vol. I, p. 31.)

whose course of study went no farther than the prymer and the "antiphoner?"¹ The answer to this question must be more or less conjectural, inasmuch as Chaucer has not chosen to be explicit on this point. Nevertheless, his account, when closely scrutinized, affords, I believe, some indication of the kind of school he had in mind.

At first one might take it for granted that a young scholar of seven would be found at an elementary school. But it should be borne in mind that in Chaucer's time there was no system of graded schools in England. Boys did not prepare themselves for admission to the grammar school by first attending the elementary school. In the grammar schools also scholars were received at the age of seven, and without preliminary training;² in the grammar schools also elementary instruction was given. The essential distinction between the grammar school and the elementary school consisted in the fact that in the former Latin was taught, but in the latter it was not. Even this line of distinction in some cases it is difficult to draw. For in some schools where the instruction was for the most part of the elementary sort, provision was made that, "if any shall be apt and disposed to learn Grammar," the master "shall instruct them therein after the best and most diligent manner that he can."³

Our question, then, resolves itself into this: Is there reason to suppose that any of the boys in Chaucer's school were studying grammar? Obviously the clergeon was not; nor was his felaw, whose vague interpretation of the anthem which he sang was based upon what he had "herd seye" rather than upon his own knowledge of Latin. Still it is not safe to conclude from this that there were not others in the school who were studying grammar. Indeed, it would be easy to believe that the felaw, in his confession of ignorance—

¹ For an account of the antiphoner and its uses, cf. Wordsworth and Littlehales, *Old Service-Books of the Engl. Church*, pp. 104 ff.

² An exception to this statement should be noted in the case of the great grammar schools of Winchester and Eton, and Dean Collet's St. Paul's school, London. The statutes of Winchester and Eton required a knowledge of Donatus for admission (H. C. Adams, *Wykehamica*, p. 53; Maxwell-Lyte, *Hist. of Eton Coll.*, p. 495). Colet's foundation statutes (1609) specified that a boy should be able "to rede and wryte his owne lesson" (J. H. Lupton's *Life of Colet*, p. 285). But these are the only exceptions I have been able to find.

³ Statutes of the school at Childrey-near-Wantage, Carlisle's *Endowed Gram. Schools*, Vol. I, p. 32.

I lerne song, I can but smal grammere —
 meant to draw a distinction between himself and other scholars
 already at their Latin. Why should the felaw have thought it
 necessary to explain he was not learning grammar, if it was not
 being taught in the schools?¹

Some confirmation of this interpretation is found, it seems to
 me, in the phrase which Chaucer employs in referring to the
 "doctrine . . . vsed there." In this school, he tells us, chil-
 dren learned "to singen and to rede." May we not suppose that
 he is here using "rede" in the special sense of reading Latin?
 The word occurs again and again in Middle English with this
 specific meaning. Thus in the *Castle off Loue* reference is
 made to "clerkes pat conne reden."² Lydgate in the same way
 speaks of—

the lewde that can not rede
 But the pater noster and the crede,³

by which he clearly means laymen whose knowledge of Latin is
 limited to these two selections from the Catechism. To cite still
 another example, I may refer to a fifteenth-century inscription on
 a tomb in the church at Spofforth, bidding the passer-by say a
 De Profundis, "if you letterd be," but—

If thou be unlearned and cannot reed,
 For our soules and all crysten soules med,
 Saye a paternoster and ave and a crede.⁴

Either the author of this inscription used "reed" in the technical
 sense of reading Latin, or he was guilty of a palpable hibernicism.

¹I owe this to the suggestion of Professor Kittredge, who has also expressed to me his
 opinion that "rede" here refers to Latin.

²*Minor Poems of the Vernon MS.*, E. E. T. S., Part I, p. 386.

³"Morita Missae," vss. 3, 4, in *Lay Folks' Mass-Book*, E. E. T. S., p. 148.

⁴Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia*, ed. 1882, Vol. III, p. lii, note. Very similar to this are
 the instructions to laymen how to conduct themselves during the mass:

If pou of letter kan,
 To be priest herken þan
 Hys office, prayere, and pistille,
 And answepe þere-to with gude wille,
 Or on a boke þy-selfe it rede.

 If pou kan noghte rede ne saye
 þy pater-noster rehers alwaye, etc.

(*Lay Folks' Mass-Book*, E. E. T. S., pp. 14-16; cf. also *Engl. Stud.*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 19, and
 Vol. XXXV, p. 31).

Moreover, in Chaucer's phrase "rede" and "singen" stand together. "Rede," thus coupled, is given a significance distinctly ecclesiastical; "to read and sing" was a stock phrase to denote the vocation of a clerk. Thus the author of *Genesis and Exodus*, who was certainly in orders, prefaces his poem by a prayer for grace to honor God:

Queðer so hic rede or singe.¹

Similarly in a "bidding prayer" in a York MS of the first half of the fifteenth century one reads: "We sall pray specially for all prestes & clerkes pat redis or singes in pis kirke or in any other."² And Chaucer himself, it will be remembered, in describing the Pardoner, mentions reading and singing as the distinctive accomplishments of the clergy:

He was in chirche a noble ecclesiaste.
Wel coude he rede a lessoun or a storie,
But alderbest he song an offertorie.³

There can be no doubt, in these cases, that the reading and singing were in Latin. Indeed, Gower, using the phrase in a similar connection, explicitly mentions Latin. Referring to the parable of Dives and Lazarus, he says:

the clerk and the clergesse
In latin tunge it rede and singe.⁴

Now, when the same phrase, "to read and sing," is used to describe the instruction given in a school it seems fair to suppose that it still retained this special sense which it had acquired in connection with the clerical profession. In support of this conclusion I may cite a passage in *Floriz and Blancheflur* where this phrase is used in precisely the same sense as in the *Prioresses Tale*. When the king suggests to his son that it is time he be put to school, Floris replies:

Ne can y in no scole syng ne rede
With-out Blancheflour.⁵

¹ *Gen. and Ex.*, E. E. T. S., vs. 34.

² *Lay Folks' Mass-Book*, E. E. T. S., p. 69. The same phrase occurs in another York Bidding Prayer printed in 1509 (*ibid.*, p. 75).

³ *Prologue C. T.*, vs. 707-9.

⁴ *Conf. Am.*, Book VI, vs. 980.

⁵ *Floriz and Blancheflur*, E. E. T. S., 1901, vss. 21, 22.

In this case, however, we are assured by what follows that it is the discipline of the grammar school which the author has in mind. For he proceeds to tell us what the two children learned after they were sent to school:

When þey had v. ȝere to scoole goone
 So wel þey had lerned þoo,
 Inowȝ þey coup of latyne,
 And wel wryte on parchemyne.¹

One should not, of course, push too far a phrase which may easily have come to be used rather loosely. Nor can one hope to reach absolute proof in regard to a matter concerning which Chaucer has not chosen to be explicit. Yet on the basis of such evidence as we have, I am inclined to believe that Chaucer, in sketching the school which the clergeon attended, had in mind the ordinary grammar school of his day.

That Chaucer should not have seen fit to introduce any young grammarians into his story, even if there were such in the school, will surprise no one. A young pedant expounding the *Alma Redemptoris* would have marred the whole effect. He chose, therefore, to mention only the younger scholars; the seven-year-old clergeon and his felaw, somewhat older, who had advanced to the study of song. The boys of the upper forms, who alone might be expected to be engaged in construing Latin, he has carefully kept off the stage.

The present article has been confined to the exposition of the *Prioresses Tale* as Chaucer tells it. Some of the conclusions here reached are strengthened when Chaucer's account is compared with the form of the legend which probably served as his source. In another article, shortly to appear, I propose, to trace the development of the legend, and to fix as closely as possible the form of the story which Chaucer had before him.

CARLETON F. BROWN.

BRYN MAWR, PA.

¹ *Ibid.*, vss. 31-34.

GOETHE'S "GOETZ VON BERLICHINGEN" AND
LILLO'S "HISTORY OF GEORGE
BARNWELL"

In *Goetz von Berlichingen* we have a number of characters that are not found in the autobiography of the old knight, the most important among them being Adelheid, Weislingen, and Maria, Goetz's sister. Weislingen's affections are divided between Maria and Adelheid, until finally Adelheid wins him over completely—a situation which was a favorite one with Goethe and other poets of the Storm and Stress. It has been pointed out by Minor¹ and Weissenfels² that *Goetz von Berlichingen* is not merely a historical drama, but contains elements of the bourgeois drama. These elements may be seen clearly in the scenes where Adelheid, Weislingen, and Maria appear. In the following I wish to show that the three characters have much in common with certain characters in Lillo's well-known play, *The London Merchant; or, The History of George Barnwell*, and that some of the scenes present striking parallels.

Lillo's tragedy³, which appeared in London in 1731, occupies an important place in the history of the German drama, small though its influence has been upon English literature. Shortly after its appearance the play was translated into French, and became known in Germany through the French translation, as was the case with so many English works during the first part of the eighteenth century. Later two German editions appeared which had been translated directly from the original.⁴ In Goethe's youth *George Barnwell* was one of the most popular plays on the German stage. When speaking of his father's aversion to the theater and his own fondness of it, Goethe relates (*Dichtung und*

¹ Schiller, Vol. II, p. 121.

² *Goethe im Sturm und Drang* (1894), Vol. I, p. 371.

³ The edition of Lillo's works before me is in two volumes (London, 1775). *The History of George Barnwell* is in the first volume.

⁴ Cf. L. Hoffmann, *George Lillo* (Diss. Marburg, 1888), pp. 18f.; Goedeke, *Grundriss*², Vol. III, p. 369.

Wahrheit, Book III), that he and his father had many disputes concerning the moral value of the stage. "Die schönen Beispiele von bestraften Vergehungen, 'Miss Sara Sampson' und 'Der Kaufmann von London,' wurden sehr lebhaft von mir hervorgehoben." Goethe mentions the play again in a letter to his sister from Leipzig (*Goethe-Jahrbuch*, Vol. VII, p. 13; Stein, *Goethe-Briefe*, Vol. I, p. 25); "Dein Leibstück den Kaufmann von London habe ich spielen sehen. Beym grössten Teil des Stückes gegähnt, aber beym Ende geweint" (1765). It would seem from this letter that Goethe had never seen a performance of the *London Merchant* before. The passage in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, however, which refers to the first Frankfort period, gives us the impression that he had seen the play. We may have here another case where Goethe's memory failed him in a minor point when writing his autobiography. It is not unreasonable, however, to assume that, though Goethe had not seen the play on the stage previous to the Leipzig performance, he was familiar with the plot and could use it as an argument for the moral value of the stage. At any rate, the fact is clearly established that at least the second part of Lillo's tragedy made a deep impression upon the young poet.

The three characters in Lillo's play that are to be compared with Weislingen, Adelheid, and Maria in *Goetz von Berlichingen* are George Barnwell, Millwood, and Maria, the daughter of the merchant Thorowgood. It must be borne in mind, however, that Lillo's artistic powers are very limited; his characters often lack psychological truth, consistency, and vitality; he is often compelled to state in so many words what Goethe expresses through indirect characterization. George Barnwell is an inexperienced, well-intentioned youth, without strength of character, who falls a prey to the wiles of Millwood and to his own amorous disposition, but not without a struggle. If his character is not so convincing as that of Weislingen, it is the fault of the poet who has failed to motivate sufficiently his moral ruin. Weislingen, though not as young and inexperienced as Barnwell, has essentially the same traits; he is well intentioned, weak, passionate. Trueman characterizes his friend Barnwell as follows (Act III, sc. 2): "an open, generous manliness of temper; his manners easy, unaffected and

engaging." The words might be applied to Weislingen. Millwood is not the common harlot that she is generally supposed to be. She may seem so perhaps at the beginning of the play, but later she rises far above the ordinary courtesan. She approaches the type of the *Machtweib* who scorns social conventions and human laws, because they interfere with her own nature, with the development of her individuality. She is thoroughly selfish, like Adelheid; she desires wealth, as Adelheid desires power and position. Barnwell is completely in her power, and when he has done for her what he could, she tries to get rid of him, as Adelheid rids herself of Weislingen. Thorowgood's daughter Maria and Goetz's sister Maria have less in common than either of the other pairs. It is not impossible that Goethe's choice of the name may be due to perhaps unconscious recollection. The name does not occur in Goetz's autobiography. Still, the use of such a common name is of little significance. Maria is in a melancholy state of mind, owing to her secret love for Barnwell. Her love, however, does not make her unmindful of her reputation. When she advances her own money to cover up Barnwell's embezzlement, she anxiously asks Trueman whether she was doing anything unbecoming her sex and character. "A virgin's fame is sullied by suspicion's lightest breath" (Act III, sc. 1). A similar state of mind is revealed by Goetz's sister in her conversation with her lover, Weislingen.

Let us now take up different scenes in the two plays. In the second scene of the first act of the *London Merchant* we find Millwood at her toilet with Lucy, her maid. Millwood relates that she has met a young man and has asked him to call.

Lucy: Is he handsome? Millwood: Ay, ay, the stripling is well made, and has a good face Lucy: Innocent, handsome and about eighteen!—you'll be vastly happy.—Why, if you manage well, you may keep him to yourself these two or three years.

In Goetz we have a similar scene between Adelheid and her maid (*Zu Bamberg*).¹ Here it is the maid who praises Weislingen's handsome appearance, as she has seen him first. "Das wäre ein

¹ *Der junge Goethe* (Vol. II, pp. 89 f.). The passages are all taken from the first version of the play, though I have retained the more familiar form Goetz.

Herr für euch," she concludes. Weissenfels (*Goethe im Sturm und Drang*, p. 513) compares this scene in Goetz with the conversation between Marwood and Hannah in Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson* (Act II, sc. 1, 2); but the characteristic remark of the maid is lacking, as Marwood and Mellefont are old acquaintances, and there is no praise of the good looks of the young man. In the second scene between Adelheid and her maid (*D. j. Goethe*, II, 94) the latter says in reference to Weislingen: "Ihr habt sein Herz geangelt und wenn er sich losreissen will verblutet er." Then she leaves the room, and Weislingen enters. In the scene between Millwood and Lucy (I, 2) Millwood says: "he has swallowed the bait, promised to come and this is the time I expect him." At this moment Barnwell knocks, and Lucy leaves the room to usher in Barnwell. The important point is not so much the similarity in the figure of speech¹ as in the dramatic technique. In the short interval between Lucy's exit and Barnwell's entrance Millwood soliloquizes about the best way of receiving Barnwell:

Less affairs must give way to those of more consequence; and I am strangely mistaken if this does not prove of great importance to me and him too before I have done with him.—Now after what manner shall I receive him? let me consider—what manner of person am I to receive? he is young, innocent, and bashful: therefore I must take care not to put him out of countenance at first.—But then if I have any skill in physiognomy, he is amorous; and, with a little assistance, we'll soon get the better of his modesty.—I'll e'en trust to nature, who does wonders in these matters.—If to seem what is not, in order to be the better lik'd for what one really is; if to speak one thing, and mean the direct contrary, be art in a woman—I know nothing of nature.

If we except the reference to Barnwell's youth and bashfulness, the words might have been spoken by Adelheid; they fully agree with her character and the whole manner in which she gains Weislingen's confidence and affection. Lillo has to resort to words; Goethe makes his persons act. Liebetraut's words to Adelheid (*D. j. G.*, II, 90), "Ihr wisst nur zu gut wie man Männer fängt," apply equally well to Millwood.

In her conversation with Barnwell, Millwood tries to persuade him not² to return to his master at once, but to stay with her. She

¹ The same figure is used at great length in *Antony and Cleopatra*, II, 5.

is aiming at his loyalty to his master, at his honesty and integrity. Similarly Adelheid persuades Weislingen to stay and to renounce his loyalty to his friend Goetz. Attention has often been called to the strange fact that Adelheid throughout the play seems to know nothing about Weislingen's attachment to Maria; her rival is Goetz, not Maria. If our theory is correct, if Goethe consciously or unconsciously developed the Weislingen plot out of material gotten from Lillo's tragedy, we should have in a way an explanation for Adelheid's ignorance of Weislingen's first love. In the scene between Barnwell and Millwood we hear only of the merchant, but not of Maria, the merchant's daughter. This is perfectly natural, as Barnwell himself at this time is not aware of Maria's love for him. Adelheid appeals to Weislingen's sense of independence and self-respect that should keep him away from Goetz. "Geh und lass dich beherrschen . . . Du wirst ein Slave eines Edelmannes werden, da du Herr von Fürsten seyn könntest" (*D. j. G.*, II, 96). Millwood says to Barnwell: "I would have you shake off all slavish obedience to your master." It is not the accidental use of *Sklave* and "slavish" that forms the parallel, but the desire of both women to make the victims independent of their friends and benefactors—a step which will make them all the more dependent upon their fair seducers. There is, to be sure, an important difference also: Millwood wants Barnwell to remain in the service of Thorowgood, as that will enable him to supply her with money. Both men are reluctant to desert their benefactors. Barnwell, realizing his situation, says to himself: "I must be gone while I have power to go;" then, turning to Millwood: "Indeed, I must (leave you) . . . should I wrong him (my master) though he might forgive me, I never should forgive myself." Weislingen says to Adelheid (*D. j. G.*, II, 95): "Ich muss (fort)! Zöge mich nicht die Ritterpflicht, der heilige Handschlag— . . . Hättest du gefühlt wie liebeich er mir begegnete." Again the similarity of the situation is of importance, not the use of "I must go." Both men strongly feel the moral obligation to their benefactors. Millwood replies to Barnwell: "Am I refus'd, by the first man, the second favour I ever stoop'd to ask? go then thou proud hard-hearted youth—But know, you

are the only man that cou'd be found, who wou'd let me sue twice for greater favours." Adelheid simply replies "So geht! (mit Verdruss)." The effect is the same; after a brief struggle both men stay. It is the beginning of their moral ruin. By staying they have become guilty of disloyalty, yes treachery; they are bound to sink deeper and deeper. Millwood's maid, Lucy, states this in an aside: "Lo! she has wheedled him out of his virtue of obedience already, and will strip him of all the rest, one after another, till she has left him as few as her ladyship, or myself." The words apply also to Weislingen; Adelheid gradually strips Weislingen of all the good qualities he may have had before. There is another slight similarity in the method pursued by the two women: they pretend to have a personal interest in their victims. Millwood says (p. 113): "the interest I have in all that relates to you." Adelheid expresses the same idea more cleverly (*D. j. G.*, II, 96): "Ich redete für eure Freiheit—und weiss überhaupt nicht was ich für ein Interesse dran nahm."

When Barnwell comes home after his first visit at Millwood's, his conscience is aroused (Act II, sc. 1): "How strange are all things round me! like some thief, who treads forbidden ground, and fain wou'd lurk unseen, fearful I enter each apartment of this well known house." Similarly, Weislingen, as soon as he has definitely decided to stay near Adelheid, is overcome for a moment by remorse and evil forebodings (*D. j. G.*, II, 97): "Auch ist mir's so unheimlich wohin ich trete. Es ist mir so bang als wenn ich von meinem Schutzgeiste verlassen, feindseligen Mächten überliefert wäre."

The two women are not content with having made traitors out of their lovers, they go farther. Barnwell is to attempt the life of his uncle, while Weislingen must hunt down and destroy his former friend and benefactor. Weislingen's reluctance to condemn Goetz (*D. j. G.*, II, 178) arouses Adelheid's anger and contempt: "ihn selbst zu verdammen—hast du nicht das Herz . . . Du bist von jeher der Elenden einer gewesen, die weder zum Bösen noch zum Guten einige Kraft haben." Franz is similarly treated. When he refuses to betray his master, Adelheid taunts him (*D. j. G.*, II, 169): "Wo bist du dem Gewissen geschwind begegnet?"

Millwood fails to understand how Barnwell, after actually murdering his uncle, should have lacked the heart to rob him. His qualms of conscience elicit the words: "It seems you are afraid of your own shadow; or what's less than a shadow, your conscience . . . Whining, preposterous, canting villain" (Act IV, sc. 2).

When Millwood sees that Barnwell is of no more use to her, yes that he will involve her in his ruin, she quickly resolves to get rid of him (Act IV, sc. 2):

"In his madness he will discover all and involve me in his ruin; we are on a precipice from whence there's no retreat for both—then to preserve myself—there is no other way—'t is dreadful—but reflection comes too late when danger's pressing—and there's no room for choice.—It must be done."

She then turns Barnwell over to the officers of the law. Adelheid only waits until Weislingen has signed Goetz's death warrant; then she poisons him, as he is in the way of her plans. The same fate overtakes Franz directly after the most passionate scene between him and Adelheid (*D. j. G.*, II, 184 f.):

Ich habe mich hoch in's Meer gewagt, und der Sturm fängt an fürchterlich zu brausen. Zurück ist kein Weg. Weh! weh! Ich muss eins den Wellen Preis geben, um das andere zu retten. Die Leidenschaft dieses Knaben droht meinen Hoffnungen . . . Du musst fort.

The words form the counterpart to Millwood's soliloquy: the same realization that the past cannot be undone, the same determination to take the next step required by the logic of events, the same apparent horror at the dreadfulness of the measure. The resourcefulness and determination of the two women come out strongly when apparently every escape is cut off. Millwood manages to find a pistol to protect herself (Act IV, sc. 2), while Adelheid just as unexpectedly draws a dagger from under her pillow (*D. j. G.*, II, 195).

Even Millwood's end bears a certain resemblance to Adelheid's death, strange as it may seem at first sight. There were three solutions that most naturally presented themselves. Goethe might have made Adelheid commit suicide, like Cleopatra in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*; or he might have allowed

her to go off unmolested, but morally annihilated, as Lessing does with Marwood in *Miss Sara Sampson*; or he could bring her before a court of justice and have her sentenced for her crimes, as is Millwood's fate. Goethe chose the third solution: Adelheid is arraigned in court, sentenced, and executed before our eyes. To be sure the court and the circumstances attending Adelheid's execution are altogether different from anything found in Lillo's play.

Before being strangled by the murderer, Adelheid exclaims in despair (*D. j. G.*, II, 195):

Mein Mass ist voll. Laster und Schande haben mich wie Flammen der Hölle mit teuflischen Armen umfasst. Ich büsse, büsse. Umsonst suchst du Laster mit Laster, Schande mit Schande zu tilgen. Die scheusslichste Entehrung und der schmachlichste Tod in einem Höllenbild vor meinen Augen.

Millwood is also overcome by despair, as her end approaches (last scene):

Is this the end of all my flattering hopes? were youth and beauty given me for a curse, and wisdom only to insure my ruin? they were, they were. Heaven, thou hast done thy worst, or if thou hast in store some untried plague, somewhat that's worse than shame, despair and death, unpitied death, confirmed despair and soul-confounding shame, . . . now pour it now on this devoted head . . . mercy's beyond my hope; almost beyond my wish. I can't repent nor ask to be forgiven.

After Millwood has been led away, Lucy describes the state of mind of her former mistress: "She goes to death encompassed with horror, loathing life, and yet afraid to die; no tongue can tell her anguish and despair." The lines may be applied word for word to Adelheid's state of mind.

There are other points in which Adelheid resembles Millwood. Adelheid's uncommon beauty and intelligence are the powerful weapons with which she conquers every man within her reach. Precisely the same qualities mark Millwood. Goethe reveals to us Adelheid's powers in the actions of the characters, Lillo again has to resort to words. Moreover, Lillo's intention is not to portray human passions, but to preach morality. Barnwell is the only man we see in Millwood's power, but we are told that no man is able to resist her. The old merchant Thorowgood, when

he sees Millwood in her apartment, exclaims (Act IV, sc. 2): "The powerful magick of her wit and form might betray the wisest to simple dotage, and fire the blood that age had froze long since." He calls her sorceress, as Weislingen calls Adelheid *Zauberin* (*D. j. G.*, II, 102). Again the parallel is not the use of the same word, but the fact that these women seem to possess almost supernatural powers. Later Thorowgood exclaims: "What pity it is, a mind so comprehensive, daring and inquisitive shou'd be a stranger to religion's sweet and powerful charms!" Even Lucy admires the "wit and beauty" of her mistress (Act I, sc. 2). The contrast between Adelheid's exterior and her black soul is forcibly brought out by the exclamation of the murderer (*D. j. G.*, II, 192): "Gott! machtest du sie so schön, und konntest du sie nicht gut machen!" Thorowgood, less forcibly, says to Millwood (IV, 2): "the abuse of such uncommon perfections of mind and body is not the least (of your faults)."

A few other scenes must be mentioned where under the surface certain striking parallels may be detected. One of the most pathetic scenes in *Goetz* is Maria's visit to Weislingen, when he is in the agonies of death. The technical reason for the visit is Maria's desire to obtain Goetz's pardon; the real reason, however, is doubtless the great dramatic possibility of a scene in which the discarded sweetheart faces her disloyal lover, who has met with just retribution. In Lillo's play we have a somewhat similar situation, when Maria visits Barnwell, who is in the despair of death—a scene which is not without power in spite of several false touches. To be sure, Maria has not been deserted by Barnwell in the same manner in which Goetz's sister has been deserted by Weislingen. Just before Maria enters, Barnwell says to himself, "I now am what I've made myself." Weislingen says to Maria (*D. j. G.*, II, 188): "Ich bin meinen eigenen Weg gegangen, den Weg zum Verderben." Both men ask their visitors to pray for them. Maria's love makes Barnwell's sufferings all the greater. "This is indeed the bitterness of death," he says to himself (p. 179). He implores Maria to leave

¹The remark of the murderer throws an interesting light upon Goethe's attitude toward personal responsibility during his Storm and Stress period; God has made man, and is responsible for the good and evil within man.

him: "fly, abhor and leave me to my fate." Trueman feels that Maria's presence can only aggravate his woes; but Maria, overcome by her grief, confesses to Barnwell her love. For Weislingen, too, the presence of Maria is only an aggravation of his sufferings; he begs Maria to leave him, but Maria stays; she remembers how strongly she once loved him, yes we feel she still loves him, but as Sickingen's wife she must not talk to him of love (*D. j. G.*, II, 186).

"Du Engel des Himmels bringst die Qualen der Hölle mit dir." Maria (p. 187): "Sein Anblick zerreisst mir das Herz. Wie liebt ich ihn! Und wie ich sein Angesicht sehe fühl ich wie lebhaft. Er hatte meine ganze Liebe, er hat mein volles Mitleiden." Weislingen (p. 189): "Geh aus der Nachbarschaft dieser Hölle . . . Ich bitte dich geh . . . Und den letzten einzigen Trost, Maria, deine Gegenwart—Ich muss dich weg bitten—Das ist mehr Qual als alles. Du Seele voll Liebe! bete für mich! bete für mich! . . . Sogar ich fühle nur Elend in deiner Liebe.

The overwhelming power of Barnwell's passion we see from his remark to Trueman (V, 1): "I was so devoted to the author of my ruin that had she insisted on my murdering thee,—I think—I should have done it." To retain Millwood's favor he actually murders his uncle who, he says, has been a father to him (III, 3). We are reminded of Franz's love-frenzy and his startling exclamation (*D. j. G.*, II, 185): "Ich wollte meinen Vater ermorden, wenn er mir diesen Platz streitig machte." Are these mad words a lingering echo of Barnwell's murder of his uncle who had been a father to him?

Whatever value may be placed upon some of the parallels, taken as a whole they seem to me to prove conclusively that Lillo's play exercised considerable influence upon the conception of the characters and of some of the scenes in the Weislingen plot of *Goetz von Berlichingen*. Weissenfels has given us an excellent account of the origins of Goethe's drama, how the poet combined into an organic whole the tendencies of his time, literary traditions, and his personal views and experiences, and put upon it the stamp of his own genius. But while he mentions Lessing's *Miss Sara Sampson* and emphasizes the influence of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, as Minor and Sauer had

done in their *Goethe-Studien*, he omits altogether Lillo's play. And yet the *History of George Barnwell* has the same claim to a place among the literary ancestors of *Goetz von Berlichingen* as Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*.¹

The importance of Millwood's character for the Storm and Stress period deserves a few additional remarks. Minor states indeed (*Schiller*, Vol. II, p. 121) that Lillo's drama is the starting-point for that type of feminine characters that finds its strongest expression in women like Marwood, Orsina, Lady Milford—a type that exercised so strange a fascination upon the German poets of the second half of the eighteenth century. But Millwood also anticipates sentiments that are characteristic of the Storm and Stress. "I follow'd my inclinations, and that the best of you do every day," she says to Thorowgood (Act. IV, sc. 2). "All actions seem alike natural and indifferent to man and beast." Her contempt for the clergy is complete.

In pride, contention, avarice, cruelty and revenge, the reverend priesthood were my unerring guides. . . . I am not fool enough to be an atheist! . . . Whatever religion is in itself, as practis'd by mankind, it has caused the evils you say it was design'd to cure.

Karl Moor expresses similar views, when he says (*Räuber*, II, 3):

Was ich gethan habe, werde ich ohne Zweifel einmal im Schuldbuch des Himmels lesen; aber mit seinen erbärmlichen Verwesern will ich kein Wort mehr verlieren.

Karl Moor's contempt of human law, to which he gives forceful utterance in several places, is shared by Millwood (IV, 2):

What are your laws, of which you make your boast, but the fool's wisdom, and the coward's valour? the instrument and screen of all your villainies; by which you punish in others what you act yourselves; or wou'd have acted, had you been in their circumstances. The judge, who condemns a poor man for being a thief, had been a thief himself had he been poor.

¹ Some of Goethe's contemporaries seem to have recognized at once a relationship between *Goetz* and Lillo's play. I infer that from a review of Chn. H. Schmid's treatise, *Über Götz von Berlichingen: Eine dramaturgische Abhandlung* (1774), which appeared in Nicolai's *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* and is reprinted in Braun, *Goethe im Urteil seiner Zeitgenossen*, pp. 336 ff. The reviewer says: "Die Scene des heimlichen Gerichts in Götz finden wir recht gut; aber warum soll nun gleich Otway, Shakespear und Lillo das entgelten?" The writer also compares Adelheid and Millwood. Schmid's treatise is not accessible to me.

Millwood's hatred and contempt of men come out in her conversation with Trueman:

That imaginary being [i. e., the devil] is an emblem of thy cursed sex collected. A mirror, wherein each particular man may see his own likeness, and that of all mankind. . . . Well may I curse your barbarous sex.

Lenz's Donna Diana in *Der neue Menoza* is filled with the same hatred:

Lass uns Hosen anziehen, und die Männer bei ihren Haaren im Blute herumschleppen . . . die Hunde, die uns die Hände lecken, und im Schläfe an der Gurgel packen (Act II, sc. 3; cf. also III, 2, 8).

JOHN A. WALZ.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

SOME HANS SACHS DISCOVERIES

In spite of the increased attention paid of late by scholars to Hans Sachs, there still remain numerous works of his unaccounted for. Some of these are doubtless lost forever, but many of them ought to be found in the course of time by systematic search in the numerous extant *meisterliederhandschriften*.

We recall that all the later *meistersingerschulen* regarded Hans Sachs as the foremost *singer* and his reform activity as exemplary. Consequently there is scarcely a *singbuch* of the late sixteenth, or of the seventeenth century that fails to contain some of the songs of our poet. In connection with my own Hans Sachs researches, it has been my good fortune to discover, among a great number of the poet's *lieder* already known, a number of others hitherto lost. Some of the latter I found in well-known MSS, others in MSS never before mentioned in this connection.

I have had occasion to examine a large number of *meisterliederhandschriften*, most of which contain more or less Hans Sachs material. Of these only the following preserve some of his *lieder*, regarded by scholars hitherto as lost:

MSS of the Stadtbibliothek, Nuremberg: Will. III 782; Solg. fol. 56¹ and ^{II}.

MSS of the Königliche Bibliothek, Dresden: Fol. M. 9; Fol. M. 16; Fol. M. 17; Quarto M. 186.

MSS of the Grossherzogliche Bibliothek, Weimar: Quarto 572; Quarto 576 Heft 1.

MS of the Königliche Bibliothek, Berlin: Fol. 25.

MS of the Universitätsbibliothek, Erlangen: Erl. 1668.

MS of the Hof- und Staatsbibliothek, Munich: cgm. 5103.

In reprinting these newly found Hans Sachs works by title, I have thought it well to arrange them by number corresponding to Vol. XXV of the Hans Sachs edition of A. v. Keller and E. Goetze.¹

¹ *Hans Sachs*. Herausgegeben von A. v. Keller und E. Goetze. Bd. XXV, herausgegeben von E. Goetze. Tübingen, 1902. I have kept as close to the various MSS as possible. Capital letters, which are used indiscriminately by many copyists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, I have been compelled to normalize. Similarly I have thought it well to

- Nr. 1220. 1543, April 28. In der freudtweis Hans v. Mainz.
 "Hört wie uns der prophet Joel." M. 9, Seite 594-596
- Nr. 1245. 1543, Juli 25. Die christlich Kirchenn.
 Im langen Ulrich Eislingers.
 "Das zwölftin apocalipsim." Solg. fol. 56ⁱ, bl. 162'-164'
- Nr. 1252. 1543, August 3. Im gulden thon Sachsen.
 Der todt July Cesaris.
 "Als Julius Cesar zu Rom." Solg. fol. 56ⁱⁱ, bl. 228-229
- Nr. 1255. 1543, August 7. In der abenteuerweis Foltzen.
 Die 18 schaut ob eim aj.¹
 "Eins tages ich zw. garte sass." M. 186, bl. 345'-346'
- Nr. 1303. 1544, Januar 5. In dem freyen thon Hanns Foltzen.
 Der hauptmann Lisias.
 "Im andren Machabeorum." Solg. fol. 56ⁱ, bl. 191-192
- Nr. 1441. 1544, Juli 17. In dem rotten thon Petter Zwinger.
 Drei schwenk Stratonici.²
 "Stratonicus der war ein harpfenschlager."
 Solg. fol. 56ⁱⁱ, bl. 225'-226'
- Nr. 1495. 1544, September 23. Im kurzen ton Wolffrans.
 Die 6 sigel des lames.
 "Johannes schreibt an dem sechsten capittel." P., bl. 168'-169'
- Nr. 1505. 1544, Oktober 7. Im langen thon Nachtigal.
 Das lob der weisheit: Salomon 8.
 "Salomon am achten erzellet."
 M. 186, bl. 20'-21'; M. 186, bl. 57-58
- Nr. 1632. 1545, März 18. Im freyen thon Hanns Foltzen.
 Joseph legt des Königs schencken und becken die treum auss der
 weinschenck wurd ledig und der beek gehenckt.
 "Do Joseph nun gefangen lag." M. 17, bl. 150'-151'
- Nr. 1649. 1545, April 9. Im schatz ton Hans Vogel.
 Dz kün weib Theosena.
 "Von Theosena wunder höre." Will. III 782, Seite 168-169
- Nr. 1691. 1545, Mai 21. Im grauen thon Regenbogen.
 König Jugurta ertödt seine zwen brüder wirt von Römern gfangen
 und ertränckt.
 "Kung Jugurtha." M. 16, Seite 12-13
- Nr. 1707. 1546, Juni 11. Die Egipter werden mit hagl geplagt.
 Im langen thon Walters von der Voglwait.
 "Do Pharao das volck von Israel." M. 17, bl. 113-114

simplify the various spellings and indications of the months, and to insert the date according to Goetze, Vol. XXV, where the MS does not give it. I have not been able to collate the spelling of some of the MSS, particularly the Dresden MSS, a second time.

¹Cf. *Sämtliche Fabeln und Schwänke von Hans Sachs*, herausgegeben von Edmund Goetze und Carl Drescher, Vol. III (Halle, 1900), No. 148; quoted as lost.

²Cf. *ibid.*, No. 164; quoted as lost.

- Nr. 1708. (1546 o. d.). Pharao wirt geblagt das alle wasser im Egipten
zw blud werden.
Im leit don Nachtigal.
"Als Pharao." M. 17, bl. 108-109
- Nr. 1789. 1545, August 21. Inn der feurweis Wolff Buchners.
Ein klag psalm der 88.
"Herr got meins heils tag unde nacht ich schreie."
Solg. fol. 56ⁱ, bl. 195-196
- Nr. 1800. 1545, September 3. Pharao gedenckt die Kinder Israel mit
listen zw. dempfen, befehls den wehmuetern.
Im langen Wolfram.
"Nach dem und Israel vil Jahr." M. 17, bl. 96'-97'
- Nr. 2304. 1547, Mai 6. In der pluttweis des alten Stolen.
Der adler mit dem jungen fuchsen.¹
"Ein adler nam eim fuchsen seine jungen."
M. 186, bl. 273'-274'
- Nr. 2328. 1547, Juni 3. In der dretten fridweis Drechsels.
Hella der Künig aus Engellant.
"Als der Kunig aus Engellande." Solg. fol. 56ⁱ, bl. 29'-30'
- Nr. 2344 (o. j. u. d.). In der sauerweis Hans Vogels.
Der verprent Kunig im sal.
"Als Sachsen von Froto war bezwungen."
M. 186, bl. 412'-413'
- Nr. 2351. 1547 (o. d.). Im rosen thon Hans Sachs.
Kunig Froto kumbt durch ein zauberin umb.
"Froto der dritt des namen was." M. 186, bl. 417-418
- Nr. 2364. 1547, Juli 4. Im starcken thon Nachtigals.
Gott wil nicht dess sünders todt.
"Im drej und drejssigisten." Erl. 1668, bl. 83'-84'
- Nr. 2369 (o. j. u. d.).² In dem langen hofton Muscapluet.
Der knecht im garten.³
"Vor manchem jar." M. 186, bl. 142-142'
- Nr. 2381. 1547, August 2. In dem ploben thon Regenpogens.
Der gestrafft Kunig aus Zipern.
"Als gleich der erst Kunig regiert." M. 186, bl. 373-374
- Nr. 2468. 1547, September 29. Im kreutz thon Walthers.
Das seufft korn.
"Im drei zehinden fein."
Solg. fol. 56ⁱⁱ, bl. 21'-22; M. 9, Seite 308-310

¹ Cf. *Fabeln und Schwänke*, Vol. IV (Halle, 1903), No. 377; quoted as lost.

² First part only, but this in Hans Sachs's own handwriting.

Cf. *Fabeln und Schwänke*, Vol. IV, No. 383; quoted as lost.

- Nr. 2480. 1547, Oktober 7. In der zugweis Frawenlobs.
Die verkaufung Esopus.¹
"Als zu verkaufen an dem marck was sten." M. 186, bl. 477'-478'
- Nr. 2493. 1547, Oktober 16. Im verborgen thon Fritz Zorn. Die mord-
terisch Konigin. Athalia.
"Als die Kunigin Athalia." M. 9, Seite 745-748
- Nr. 2515. Oktober 31. Inn der gesangweis des Leschen.
Die zukunft Christi.
"Amos am letzten der prophet." M. 9, Seite 743-745
- Nr. 2521. 1547, November 3. In der traumweis Heinrich Mueglings.
Draum vom lewen.
"Es traumbt ein purger alte." M. 186, bl. 471'-472'
- Nr. 2612. 1548, Februar 22. Im leidton Regenbogens.
Der 132 psalm.
"Gedenecke o herr an David." P., bl. 157-158
- Nr. 2613. 1548, Februar 22. Im kurzen ton Lenhart Nunnenbeck.
Vermanung zum gebet, psalm 134.
"Tutt loben den herren ihr knecht sein." P., bl. 398-399 (mit Noten); M. 9, Seite 616-617 (Seit loben).
- Nr. 2622. 1548, März 1. Im reuter thon Kuntz Fulsack.
Die alt kuplerin.²
"Ein zimmerman." Solg. fol. 56ⁿ, bl. 234-235
- Nr. 2628. 1548, März 3. In der zugweis frawenlobs.
Der edelman mit dem edlen stain.³
"Ein edelman kam auf ein schlos geriten." M. 186, bl. 469-470
- Nr. 2645. 1548, März 16. Inn der allment des Stolln.
Der mördisch Römer Silla.
"Als Silla zu Rom gwaltig wur." Solg. fol. 56^f, bl. 245'-246'
- Nr. 2650. 1548, März 20. Die versteinigung Christi.
In der zugweis Fritz Zornns.
"Warlich ich sage euch warleiche." Solg. fol. 56^f, bl. 131'-132'
- Nr. 2676. 1548, April 6. Im suesen thon Schillers.
Der unberedt ritter.⁴
"Ein edle fraw genandt." M. 186, bl. 468-469
- Nr. 2678. 1548, April 6. Inn der gesangweis Römers.
Die drei buleten schwester.⁵
"Bocacius schreibt wie in Marsilia sas." Solg. fol. 56^f, bl. 249-250

¹ Cf. *Fabeln und Schwänke*, Vol. IV, No. 408; quoted as lost.

² Cf. *ibid.*, No. 456; quoted as lost.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 462; quoted as lost.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 481; quoted as lost.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 482; quoted as lost. The content of this No. 482 isn't that of a "Schwank."

- Nr. 2714. 1548, Mai 2. Inn dem gulden thon Wolffrans.
Die red der 7 philosophy.
"Nach dem Alexander magnus." Solg. fol. 56ⁱ, bl. 243-244
- Nr. 2729. 1548, Mai 11. In dem feinen thon Walthers.
Underscheid der klaiden.
"Es beschreibet uns Pluetarchus." M. 186, bl. 467-468
- Nr. 2730. 1548, Mai 12. In dem hohen thon des alten Stolen
Der gros fisch.¹
"Philoxenus der poet ase." M. 186, bl. 470'-471'
- Nr. 2732. 1548, Mai 12. In der meyenweis Eisingers.
Der philosophus mit dem schuster.
"Es hat beschrieben Plutarchus." Will. III 782, Seite 961-962
- Nr. 2751. 1548 (o. d.). In dem gulten thon Sachsen.
Ein straf gotlicher weisheit.²
"Die weisheit auf der gasen klagt." M. 9, Seite 1195-1197
- Nr. 2790. 1548, Juni 28. In dem gfangen thon H. Vogel.
Der engel auf dem roten ross.
"Als Israhel gefangen lag."
Solg. fol. 56ⁿ, bl. 144'-146; M. 9, Seite 273-275 (date 1546,
Juli 28); M. 186, bl. 58'-59'
- Nr. 2864. 1548, August 28. Im langen thon Nachtigal.
Die unschuldigen kindle.
"Do die weisen hin zogen schwinde."
Solg. fol. 56ⁿ, bl. 12'-13'
- Nr. 2872. 1548, August 31. In dem spiegelthon Frawenlobs.
Der schaz im weinperg.³
"Ein weingartner drej sune hett." M. 186, bl. 328'-329
- Nr. 2909. 1548, Oktober 4. Die geburt gottes, sündigt nit mer.
Im klingenden thon Sachsen, 1. Joh., 1 Cap.
"Wir wissen das wer von got ist geboren."
Solg. fol. 56ⁱ, bl. 157'-158'
- Nr. 2912. 1548, Oktober 5. Im feinen thon Walther von der (Vogelweid)⁴
Die bruntzend beurin.⁵
"Als sant Petter auff erden ging." Solg. fol. 56ⁱ, bl. 325'-326
- Nr. 2917. 1548, Oktober 9. In dem langen thon Muscapluets.
Der lauser.⁶
"Ein boeses weib." M. 186, bl. 116'-117'
- Nr. 2934. 1548, Oktober 23. In der circelweiss Albrecht Leschen.
Der kampff Archelaus mit Herculi.
"Nachdem alss Dionire." Will. III 782, Seite 164-165

¹ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 498; quoted as lost.³ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 522; quoted as lost.⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 532; quoted as lost.² Read "w-heit."⁴ Reads "von der."⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 536; quoted as lost.

- Nr. 2963. 1548, November 6. In der flamweiss herr Wolffran.
Der habicht mit der nachtigal.¹
"Ein habichtt in eim grunen thal."
Will. III 782, Seite 196-197
- Nr. 2970. 1548, November 7. Die Sybilla Amalthea.
In dem geschiden thon Nachtigalls.
"Amalthea die ware."
Solg. fol. 56^l, bl. 171-171'
- Nr. 2971. 1548, November 8. In dem schwarzen thon Clingensor.
Der purger² mit dem arzt.³
"Ein purger lag heftig dott kranck."
M. 186, bl. 337-337'
- Nr. 3033. 1549, Februar 7. In der zuegweis Frauenlobs.
Die 3 selb erwölten döt.
"Drei selb erwoelte dött hat uns beschrieben."
M. 186, bl. 353'-354
- Nr. 3070. 1549, April 16. Im grün thon Frawenlobs.
Der puelent Kunig Regnerus.
"Als Regnerus in Schweden."
M. 186, bl. 414-415
- Nr. 3076. 1549, April 17. In des Römers gesangweis.
Kunig Magno wird ausgeschniden.
"Als Magnus der dritt Kunig in Norwegen war."
M. 186, bl. 405-406'
- Nr. 3118. 1549, Juli 5. In der narrenweys,⁴ M. Schrots.
Von den naren.⁵
"Gleich wie in dem sumr der schne."
Q. 576, Heft 1, bl 56'-58
- Nr. 3150. 1549, September 30. In der hohen junglingweis C. Otten-
dorffer.
Der purger von Straspurg.⁶
"Fro Straspurg sas."
M. 186, bl. 136-137
- Nr. 3152. 1549, Oktober 1. Der blintgeborn. Aligoria.
Im parratrey Kettners.
"Christus zu Betsaida war."
Solg. fol. 56ⁿ, bl 42-43
- Nr. 3171. 1549 (o. d.). In dem gulden thon Kantzlers.
Der pischhof mit dem prediger.⁷
"Zw Speir ein pischhof ware."
M. 186, bl. 466-467
- Nr. 3252. 1550, März 19. Die erscheinung und himelfart Christi.
Im dailton Nachtigal.
"Als Jesus erstundt von dem todtt."
Solg. fol. 56^l bl. 125-126

¹ Cf. *Fabeln und Schwänke*, Vol. IV, No. 552; quoted as lost.

² Reads "purcr."

³ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 555; quoted as lost.

⁴ Reads "narrinweys."

⁵ Reads "narin."

⁶ Cf. *Fabeln und Schwänke*, Vol. V (Halle, 1904), No. 612; quoted as lost.

⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, No. 626; quoted as lost.

- Nr. 3257. 1550, (Mey)¹ 22. Im leid thon Frauenlobs.
Art und lon der gotlosen wider die selig Malachias 3 caput
"Malachias." M. 9, Seite 338-340
- Nr. 3267. 1550 (o. d.). Im linden thon Jeroni Dreyboltzs.
Hilf gotes wider die feind.
"Esaias spricht schlecht." M. 9, Seite 202-204
- Nr. 3275. 1550, April 5. Im süssen thon dess Regenbogen.
Warum Israel gefangen sey.
"Baruch am dritten spricht." Erl. 1668, bl. 82-82'
- Nr. 3319. 1550, Mai. 14. In dem pfuegthon Sigharts.
Der pest freundt.
"Ein guet gsell fraget mich der mer"
M. 186, bl. 336-336'; M. 16, bl. 328'-329'
- Nr. 3402. 1550, Juni 22. Im uberlangen ton Bartolme Regenbogen.
David mit Absalom ein figur Christi mit dem sathan.
"Nach dem David." Will. III 782, Seite 134-137
- Nr. 4287. 1554, März 14. In der engelweiss Hanss Vogel.
Der Samaritter. Alligoria.
"Christus det sein jungren ein gleichnuss sagen"
Q. 572, bl. 343'-345'
- Nr. 4311. 1554, April 3. In der hönweis Wolframs von Eschenpach.
Drey straf vom wein.
"Eschelos der weis mone." M. 186, bl. 232
- Nr. 4326. 1554, Mai 11. In dem dailton Hans Folzen.
Der dorff pfaff mit dem bischoff²
"Auf einem dorff ein pfarher sas." Will. III 782, Seite 1107
- Nr. 4338. 1554, Mai. 14. Im langen thon Hopfengarten.
Dancksagung dz gott ales erhelt.
"Ir himel lobt den herren reich." M. 16, bl. 469-470
- Nr. 4374. 1554, Juni 21. Im langen hofthon Muscaplut.
Der edelman rait dem munich das pferd weck.³
"Ein edelman." M. 186, bl. 194-195'
- Nr. 4394. 1554, Juli 9. Im barat reyen Fritz Ketners.
"Got der ist unser zuversicht." Fol. 25, Seite 116-119 (mit Noten)
- Nr. 4395. 1554, Juli 9. Im braunen thon Regenbogen.
"Es lag ein stat in Arcadier lande." M. 16, Seite 17-18
- Nr. 4403. 1554, Juli 11. In der traumweiss Mügling.
Hercules erschlegt die rauber erlost de 7. Jungkfrauen.
"Busiris der tirane" Erl. 1668, bl. 490-490'

¹ Reads "Mey;" should be "März" in all probability.

² Vol. VI of *Fabeln und Schwänke*, of which this would be No. 890, is still in preparation.

³ Would be *Fabeln und Schwänke*, Vol. VI, No. 905.

- Nr. 4419. 1554, Juli 20. In dem vergolten thon Wolframs.
Die mordisch pfafenwal.
"In Ritzo im Welschlande." M. 186, bl. 201
- Nr. 4433. 1554, Juli 28. Im kronen thon R. Dullers.
Der 64 psalm.
"Gott erhör mein stim kläglich." Q. 573, bl. 112'-114
- Nr. 4457. 1554, August 14. Im hofthon Zwingers.
Der leichtfertig pfarherr.¹
"In einem dorf ein pfarherr sas." M. 16, bl. 107-107'
- Nr. 4483. 1554, September 3. In der karenpluet Hans Schreiers.
Das glück und unglücklich leben Kunig Agathocles.
"Agathocles der kunig war eins hafners sun." M. 186, bl. 411-412
- Nr. 4508. 1554, Oktober 6. In der lerchenweis Endres.
Die christlich gedult.
"Christus thet auf sein mund." Solg. fol. 56", bl. 17-17'
- Nr. 4510. 1554, Oktober 8. In der donnerweyss Regenbogen.
Pharao wirt in seinem land mit hagel donner und fewer geplaget.
"Mose im andren buch." M. 16, Seite 10-12
- Nr. 4519. 1554, Oktober 12. In der narrenweiss Schrats.
Von narren.
"Eclesiastes Salomo." M. 16, bl. 199-199'
- Nr. 4520. 1554, Oktober 12. In dem newen thon Onofferi Schwartzpach.
Das neunt capittel ecclesiastes.
"Eclesiastes saget." cgm. 5103, bl. 263-264
- Nr. 4525. 1554, Oktober 22. In der geteilten krugeweise Hans Leutesdorfer.
Der zerbrochen krug.
"Der herr sprach zu Jeremie." P., bl. 445'-446'
- Nr. 4533. 1554, Oktober 13. Im newen thon Frawenlobs.
Von israelischer beschneydung und haltung dess passah. Das himmel-brot nam ein ende.
"Josua an dem fünfften stete." M. 16, bl. 33-33'
- Nr. 4537. 1554, November 5. In dem verwirten ton Hanss Fogels.
Dess osterlemleins blut.
"In Exodo geschriben stet." Q. 572, bl. 32-34
- Nr. 4571. 1554, Dezember 18. In der alment Frid. Stollen.
Eins soldans mödrische that.
"Ludovicus Varthomanus." M. 16, Seite 103-104

JOSEPH BEIFUS.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

¹ Would be No. 919, Vol. VI of *Fabeln und Schwänke*.

SOME FEATURES OF STYLE IN EARLY FRENCH NARRATIVE POETRY (1150-70)

II. DIRECT REPETITION OF WORDS, PHRASES, AND LINES

The parallelism which shows itself in the transposition of the repeated passage from one couplet (or *laisse*) to another, with change of rhyme, is much the more interesting form of repetition in mediæval French literature. But it is by far the less frequent. The period of its vigorous life was short, and even during this brief existence its popularity was constantly menaced by its older rival—direct repetition in the same or in consecutive couplets without regard to the rhyme. Direct repetition is at its best when expressed by single words or short phrases, as the hemistich of an octosyllabic line. It is less effective, and less usual, when it covers the whole line.

The ultimate origin of direct repetition is clear. A natural desire for emphasis produces it. It probably appears with the first literary productions of a people. It survives all other forms of linguistic art. There is therefore no occasion to wonder at its prevalence in French poetry during the sixth and seventh decades of the twelfth century. The example set by the older lyric and epic, or by contemporaneous Latin literature, especially where the style of the latter was inspired by models found in the Scriptures, would only go to strengthen a tendency which was inherent and spontaneous. We may also assume that at this particular period the dialectics of the Schoolmen, with which writers like Wace were thoroughly familiar, did not fail to influence the expression of thought in the vernacular in the direction of alertness and clearness. At all events, the variety of the forms of direct repetition, which is noticeable in the narrative poets of this first Renaissance, could be plausibly attributed to more than one source.

Direct repetitions of less than a line in length begin with the earliest Romance verse, with the Provençal *Boethius* and *Passion du Christ*, with the French *Ste. Eulalie* and *Vie de St. Léger*. The first words of the first *laisse* in *Boethius* are repeated by the

first words of the second *laisse*.¹ Also single words are repeated in consecutive lines:

Lai o solien las altrás leisjut jar,
Lai veng lo reis sa felnia menár.
Lai fo Boecis e foren i soi par. (61-63)

Phrases are repeated in successive or alternate lines:

Zo signifiga la vita qui en ter'es.
Zo signifiga de cél la dreita lei. (206, 208)
Contra felnia sunt fait de gran bontat,
Contra perjúri de bona feeltat,
Contr' avaricia sun fait de largetat, etc. (218 ff.)

Perhaps a larger number of instances of direct repetition are to be found in the *Passion du Christ*.²

The earliest French poem, *Ste. Eulalie*,³ reveals the same tendency, a tendency in which its Latin original does not share:

Voldrent la veintre li deo inimi.
Voldrent la faire diaule servir. (3, 4)
Ne por or, ned argent, ne paramenz,
Por manatee regiel ne preiement. (7, 8)

The *Vie de St. Léger* presents some instances of transposed parallelism, as we have seen in our previous article. We may therefore expect to find in it the less artistic forms of direct repetition. Words are repeated in successive hemistichs of the same line:

Ciel' ira grand et ciel corropt (105)

¹See P. Meyer, *Recueil d'anciens textes*, p. 23. Pio Rajna in his *Origini dell'Epopea Francese* attributes the repetitions in *Boethius* to the direct influence of the French epic (*Origini*, pp. 490-93). We do not understand this statement to exclude other influences than the national epic, particularly in such passages as we quote above (cf. ll. 218-29). The only instance where we note the repetition of an entire line,

Tuit a plorâr repairen mei talant.
Tuit mei talant repairen a plorâr. (80, 91)

involves a change of rhyme and might be cited as an example of transposed repetition. The transposed line (80) in this case, however, involves a break with the usual syntactical order of the Romance phrase, which is represented by l. 91. It might be questioned whether the author in his effort to make his rhyme had not been guided in this instance by Latin models. Besides, the effect is more that of a refrain, since the line comes at the end of successive *laissez*.

²See Foerster und Koschwitz, *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch*, ll. 7, 8; 22, 23; 330, 331, 334, 335; 435, 436; 491, 494. Cf. J. Vising, "Les Débuts du style français," *Recueil de mémoires philologiques présenté à M. Gaston Paris*, pp. 184, 185.

³Foerster und Koschwitz, *op. cit.*

and hemistichs and phrases are repeated in alternate or consecutive lines:

Cio li preia, lâissas lo toth.

Cio li preia, païas ab lui. (106, 108 [cf. 110, 112; 203, 204])

We have already noticed the apparent unwillingness of the author of *St. Alexis* to employ the forms of transposed repetition. But he quite atones for this neglect by the variety and frequency of his direct repetitions. The first hemistich of the poem recurs at l. 8, the first hemistich of l. 117 at ll. 120 and 121, the first hemistich of l. 235 at ll. 238 and 260, and so on. Single words are repeated in successive lines or hemistichs:

Tantes dolors at por tei enduredes,

E tantes fains e tantes seiz passedes,

E tantes laïrmes por le tuencors ploredes! (397-99 [cf. 471-73])

O bele boche, bels vis, bele faiture, (481)

Que valt cist criz, cist duels ne ceste noise? (502) etc.

In the first epic poems extant, *Roland*, *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, *Gormund et Isembard*, the number and kinds of direct repetitions, whether of single words, phrases, or lines, are considerably increased. Repetitions of words, as *tant* in *Roland* (525-27, 553-55, 1399-1401, etc.), *cil* or *cist* in *Roland* (1452, 1453; 1612, 1613; 1810, 1811; 3307-9; 3482-86), *ne* in *Roland* (2134-36; 2399-2401) and the like; *quant* in *Pèlerinage* (15-17), and *les* in *Pèlerinage* (105, 106); of short phrases, as *e pur* in *Roland* (2211, 2212), *e la* in *Roland* (3224-30), *veez cum* in *Pèlerinage* (448, 449); of hemistichs in consecutive lines (*Roland*, 1988, 1989; 2322-24; 2854, 2855), or after an interval (*Roland*, 1889, 1902; 2909, 2916; *Pèlerinage*, 371, 377, 382; 601, 628; 650, 653, 665; 734, 737; 768, 777, etc.; *Gormund et Isembard*, 41, 65; 69, 78, etc.); and of entire lines (*Roland*, *passim*; *Pèlerinage*, 241, 249; 270, 338; 383, 443; 466, 563, 590; *Gormund et Isembard*, 492, 498; 563, 565), all would tend to prove that direct parallelism had become a component part of poetic art before the beginning of the twelfth century.

The few remains of the didactic writers of this period tell the same story. Philippe de Thaun uses direct repetition whenever convenient. So does the author of *St. Brandan*, who even takes

a step in advance, and by repeating a substantive in successive hemistichs gives us a foretaste of the effect this kind of parallelism is to produce with the poets of the mediæval Romantic School, younger than he by a generation:

Peril devant, peril desus,
Peril detriers, peril dejus. (1234, 1235)

The gap in vernacular literature between Philippe de Thaun and the author of *St. Brandan* on the one hand, and Gaimar and Wace on the other, is not so serious to bridge over, when we recall that these last-named pioneers of the literary revival which followed the Crusade of 1147 were, like the elder poets, nurtured in the schools of Normandy and England, and received their first literary impressions from the court of Henry I. We might therefore expect them to hand down the literary traditions of the twenties. And the younger poets, contemporary with Gaimar and Wace, with few exceptions, perhaps none, were also clerks, brought up in monastic foundations and trained in the learning of the day. Consequently the literature of the period from 1150 to 1170, the output of the first Romantic School, should preserve the general features which had distinguished French literature under Henry I. The educational environment of the poets of this second generation had practically remained the environment of the author of *Roland* and Philippe de Thaun. It would therefore be logical that the conceptions of style which obtained with these authors should be reaffirmed in the works of Wace, Thomas, or even Chrétien de Troies. New influences had indeed entered, to modify and enlarge. But whether Eastern or Provençal in origin, these new influences had been quickly assimilated, had been grafted on the indigenous tree. Better fruit might be the result, but its flavor would still smack strongly of the native soil. So with direct repetition. It continued as it began, in many particulars. Indeed, the recent rise of scholasticism had only intensified the inherent desire for emphatic reiterated statement. The debates of the schools over the meanings of words and their striving for accurate definitions could not fail to react on the expression of the vernacular poets who had been educated in them. Wace, for instance, shows a decided liking for subtle dis-

tinctions and for plays on words. This liking must have been given him by his education. And Thomas, the author of *Tristan*, reveals such fondness for what might be called pseudo-psychology, that we are almost forced to attribute its origin to his familiarity with those analyses of ideas which claimed so large a share of the attention of the dialecticians.

But with the poets of the fifties direct parallelism is expressed in phrases which mark a considerable advance in literary art. As we have said, the citation made above from *St. Brandan* foretells the manner of the later generation, more rhetorical and declamatory, but also more poetical. You do not find Gaimar remaining satisfied with a simple repetition of connectives or adverbs, as *pur quei* (256-58) or *u* (1035, 1036). He tries the repetition of synonyms in successive hemistichs and lines:

E lur herneis, e lur avers,
E lur tresors, e lur maners. (1003, 1004)

But it is Wace particularly who exercises his talents in order to enlarge the possibilities of direct repetition—direct repetition constitutes his main contribution to literary style—and his improvements are of so striking a nature that they may be said to have founded a school of expression. During the next decade and longer the leading poets look back to Wace's *Brut* as a classic. From it they get a more lively form of repetition in the case of single words:

Or tost, or tost, montez, montez,
Poignez, poignez, corez, corez. (12174, 12175)
Ça dui, ça troi, ça cinq, ça sis,
Ça set, ça huit, ça neuf, ça dis. (12184, 12185)

They also find in it an emphatic combination of synonyms and words describing objects that are alike:

Pran mes cités, pran mes manoirs,
Pran mes trésors, pran mes avoirs. (6733, 6734¹ [cf. 10879-94])

Wace occasionally employs direct repetition for the purpose of contrasting words of opposite meaning, the antithetical phrase which became such a favorite of French composition, and which

¹ But see the citation from Gaimar above, which may have been a model for Wace in his turn.

appears at an early hour in French literary history. First among his nation he describes the effects of love.

Ne puis aler, ne puis venir,
Ne puis villier, ne puis dormir,
Ne puis lever, ne puis colchier,
Ne puis boire, ne puis mangier. (*Brut*, 8887-90)

Or again he puts endearing epithets together in a way that foreshadows lyric passages in later romantic poems:

Lasse! caitive, ma dolçor,
Ma joie, mon déduit, m'amour
A li gians à honte ocise. (*Op. cit.*, 11796-98)

The influence of the Schoolmen's dialectics is traceable in the *Brut*, whether applied to the analysis of abstract conceptions:

Oisdivie met home en perece,
Oisdivie amenuise proëce,
Oisdivie esmuet les leceries,
Les jurèces et drueries, (11021-24)

or revealed in the desire to make plays on words, the false distinctions of argument and debate:

Mult me desdaigne, en mervillant,
Et me mervel, en desdegnant, (10923, 10924)
Mult me desdaing, mult me mervel. (10927)

Thus the direct form of repetition, which produces the sensation of alertness, exactness, vividness under the pen of a good writer, may also develop, under the guidance of scholastic training, the qualities of refinement and distinction of thought which we qualify as *précieux*, when we encounter them in more recent literature. These qualities we have come to recognize as inseparable attributes of the French mind; but we are none the less indebted to Wace and his clerical education for their first successful exposition as features of literary style. It is quite likely that the *Brut* owed its reputation among subsequent authors to these characteristics. They regarded its phrases as standards of expression. They continued, for sometime, to imitate and adapt its periods. A few, indeed, tried to undermine its authority, but the larger number upheld its sway.

Did the author of *Thèbes*, antagonistic as he is to Wace in

many respects, and particularly in this matter of parallelism, weaken at times and fail to guard his independence against the encroachments of Wace's style? Such would seem to be the case, because direct repetition of words and phrases are not wholly lacking in his great romance, though it does not occur so frequently as in the *Brut*, nor is it by any means so prominent. For instance, repetitions of individual words are quite restricted in *Thèbes*:

Por mon seignor ai jo mout fait,
 Maintes peines et maint mal trait,
 Et receu maintes coles. (3733-35)
 Le rei guardent quant il conseille
 Et quant il dort et quant il veille. (4067, 4068)

Even more limited is the reiteration of phrases. There is one antithetical passage which recalls the manner of the *Brut*:

Nus nel viée, nus ne l'otreie,
 Ne nus nel tout, ne nus nel done, (2810, 2811)

and in the following lines the poet is evidently conscious of the repetition of both word and hemistich:

Par le tornei ensemble vont,
 En la grant presse ensemble sont;
 Il et li reis ensemble poignent,
 Il et li reis ensemble joignent. (6933-36)
 Al cors escorre grant gent meine,
 Al cors tolir meine grant torbe;
 Ypomedon le li destorbe;
 Ypomedon le li defent. (6946-49)¹
 Ne lor toudront, se nes ocient;
 Ne lor toudront, ço cuit, mais hué. (6964, 6965)

Yet if we take all such passages together, and add to direct repetition within the couplet (the usual form in the *Brut*) direct repetition in consecutive lines of different couplets (the case of the last two citations from *Thèbes*), we find that the total number in *Thèbes* is inconsiderable. The repetitions in *Thèbes* are also less striking, less varied, and less original than in the *Brut*. The

¹This particular passage recalls the forms of transposed parallelism. In the second line the rhyme word is transposed. In the last the rhyme word is replaced by a synonym. The combination of the four lines, however, would seem to be due to the poet's wish to repeat the first hemistich, rather than to any notion of varying the rhyme.

author had no interest in them. He expended his strength on perfecting his conception of transposed repetition. Direct repetition may have seemed to him commonplace, simple. He was attracted by the more difficult manner, which required skill to harmonize the demands of syntax with the necessities of versification.

If this conclusion is a correct one, it is surprising that *Énéas*,¹ later than *Thèbes*, but very like it in content and spirit, should reject the more artistic parallelism of its romantic forerunner and follow the simple forms which the *Brut* had made popular. For *Énéas* contains quite as many and quite as extended repetitions of single words as Wace's chronicle; namely, *grant* (*Énéas*, ll. 51, 52), *molt* (ll. 331-34), *porquei* (ll. 1984-1990). Reiterated phrases also occur frequently, whether within the same couplet or, like *Thèbes*, in consecutive lines of different couplets:

Entre ses braz tot nu tenir;
Entre ses braz le cuide estreindre. (1238, 1239)
Et li altre de busche atraire,
Et li altre vont por les mors. (6078, 6079)

Énéas also offers analyses of ideas, quite in Wace's manner, as is shown by the following definition of love's attributes:

Amors molt fait ome hardi,
Amors molt tost l'a enaspri.
Amors, molt dones vassalages!
Amors, molt faiz creistre barnages!
Amors, molt es de grant efforz!
Amors, molt es reides et forz! (9061-66)

The repetitions in *Énéas* offer a redundancy of words which would classify them with the repetitions in the *Brut*. This classification seems all the more noticeable when we take into account the advantage which the author of *Énéas* might have gained by following the transposed parallelism of *Thèbes* as opportunity offered, an advantage he appears to have deliberately refused; for when he wished to repeat the idea of a hemistich or line, instead of using the mannerism of *Thèbes*, with which he must have been acquainted, he chose a much less effective form:

¹ Edited by J. Salverda de Grave, *Bibliotheca Normannica*, Band IV.

Cartage virent, la cité,
 Dont Dido tint la dignité.
 Dame Dido tint le país, (375-77)
 Ja nus oem armez n'i venist,
 Que la pierre a sei nel traisist:
 Tant n'i venissent o halbers,
 Ne fussent lués al mur aers. (437-40)
 Ja de toz cels n'issist uns fors,
 Ne fust detrenchiez et ocis,
 Ja uns seuls d'els nen issist vis; (936-38)
 Molt a dur cuer kil tochera,
 Kil vult ocire onkes n'ama;
 Onkes de buone amor n'ot cure
 Ki tochera tel criature; (5231-34)

A comparison with like parellelistic passages in *Thèbes* discloses at once the artistic inferiority of *Énéas*.

The date of *Énéas* has not been determined, but in the matter of versification it seems to be older than Gautier d'Arras' first poem, *Éracle*, which was probably begun by 1165. In *Éracle* Gautier employs transposed parallelism, as we have seen. He also uses various kinds of direct repetition, thereby confessing to eclecticism, and also to lack of originality when placed beside his models of the *Brut* and *Thèbes*. Simple repetitions of words are frequent in *Éracle*, as *quanque* (698-700) *quoique* (4662, 4663), or *voiz* (5692-94). Of a higher grade is this repetition of *bel*:

Bel sont si crin, bel sont si ueil,
 Bele bouche a, bel nés, bel vis,
 Bel est trestout, çou m'est avis. (2603-5)

Phrases are often repeated in *Éracle*, as *ne plus tost* (3805, 3806), *li uns . . . li dui* (4918-21), *et maint* (5433-36), while the simple form of lyric parallelism is recalled by the repetition of lines in successive couplets:

Pour çou me dueil qu'il ne s'en dueut:
 Pour çou me dueil que il nel set. (3923, 3924)

Lines are also repeated on the same rhyme, but with a new rhyme word:

Tant maintes foiz i ai alé,
 Tant maintes foiz i ai balé,
 [E maintes foiz i ai sailli,] (3944-46)

or with less exactness:

Pleurent cousines et cousin,
Pleurent voisines et voisin. (4022, 4023)

Repetition of ideas occurs, as in the proverb:

Car puis que sire a chier sen chien,
Tuit li autre li vuelent bien:
Tant que li sire a chier celui,
Tant le chierist n'i a celui; (1916-19 [cf. 812-15, etc.])

In general it may be said that *Éracle* presents many instances of direct repetition and a considerable variety of parallelistic forms, but displays an inferior talent in expressing them.

Gautier's second poem of *Ille et Galeron*, which was composed under auspices quite different from the environment of *Éracle*, reveals a smaller number of parallelistic passages and less variety of form. Transposed parallelism disappears entirely. From the direct kinds we miss the analysis of ideas. Its repetition of words savors strongly of Wace:

Illes les plaise, Illes les fiert,
Illes les destruist et requiert,
Illes lor perce lor escus,
Illes les fait tous irascus,
Illes lor fausse lor haubers,
Illes les fait chocier envers. (742-47 [cf. 2723, 2724, etc.])

On the other hand, repetitions of phrases which include the larger part of the line, or repetitions of lines in the same couplet with change of the word at the rhyme seem to be particularly favored:

Lors n' i a nul qui cuer ne coelle,
Lors n' i a nul qui fûir voelle. (2683, 2684)
Con malement il nos bailissent,
Con malement il nos tràissent! (2775, 2776)
Por coi mesciet il dont as buens?
Por coi mesciet il dont as tuens? (2955, 2956)

The proper emphasis is attained by repeating the hemistichs of a line separately in a new couplet:

Merci li qiert, merci li rent,
Tot selone l'oeuvre et l'errement.
Merci li quiert qu'il li dist lait,
Merci li rent de ce k'a fait. (3253-56)

We have called Gautier an eclectic in the matter of style. The same term might be applied, perhaps, to his contemporary, Thomas, the author of *Tristan*. Thomas possessed, however, what Gautier lacked, originality. His poetic merit is also much greater. His originality is shown by the development he gave to the transposed parallelism of *Thèbes*. His poetical talent is proven by the depth of feeling he imparted to the sentiment already inherent in many of the direct repetitions of the *Brut*. From the fragments of his *Tristan* which are extant it would seem that he was endowed with the gift of infusing even into repetitions of single words a deeper meaning than they had before enjoyed. Several passages attest this ability:

Dunt me vint ceste volenté
 E cest desir e cest voleir
 U ceste force u cest poeir
 Que jo vers ceste m'acointai, (600-3)
 Suffert en ad tantes dolurs,
 Tantes peines, tantes poürs,
 Tantes anguisses, tanz perilz,
 Tantes mesaises, tanz eissilz. (1863-66)

In both these citations the repetition is employed to heighten the effect produced by a sequence of synonyms. Somewhat the same result is also reached in the well-known passage at the end of the poem:

Aveir em poissent grant confort,
 Encuntre change, encuntre tort,
 Encuntre paine, encuntre plur,
 Encuntre tuiz engins d'amur! (3141-44)

In the citations already made we detect a tendency toward alliteration, as well as toward the analysis of sentiment by the use of synonyms. Elsewhere we find these tendencies emphasized. For a repetition of the same idea with Thomas quite often involves the play on words which we noticed in Wace when he became analytical. And with this play on words is sometimes combined a variation of phrase which, when expressed in consecutive lines, reminds us strongly of the manner of transposed parallelism:

Tant se deit deliter al rei
 Oblier deit l'amur de mei,
 En sun seigneur tant deliter

Que sun ami deit oblier.
 E! quei li valt ore m'amur
 Emvers le delit sun seignur? (155-60)

By such reiterations Thomas attained a degree of *préciosité* which gave his *Tristan* a fleeting vogue in the more refined courts of the time, perhaps in those circles particularly where feminine influence was most potent. Furthermore, his subtleness of reasoning has persisted beyond his immediate admirers, and through one passage at least has found an echo in the verse of a modern romanticist:

Le nun, la belté la reïne
 Nota Tristrans en la meschine:
 Pur le nun prendre ne la volt
 Ne pur belté, ne fust Ysolt.
 Ne fust ele Ysolt apelee,
 Ja Tristrans ne l'oüst amee;
 Se la belté Ysolt n'oüst,
 Tristrans amer ne la potüst;
 Pur le nun e pur la belté,
 Que Tristrans en li ad trové,
 Chiet en desir e en voleir
 Que la meschine volt avoir. (273-84)

Repetitions like this are quite frequent in *Tristan* and form its predominant characteristic. Yet, as we have seen, the more simple manner handed down by the *Brut* is quite as much in evidence. It inspired many of the verses already quoted, and the celebrated couplet which was taken over bodily from *Tristan* by Gottfried von Strassburg:

Isôt ma drûe, Isôt m'amie,
 En vûs ma mort, en vûs ma vie!¹

Chrétien de Troies did not adopt at any time the complete form of transposed parallelism so diligently cultivated by the author of *Thèbes*. He could hardly bring himself to even two transpositions of the final hemistich of a couplet in his first long poem of *Érec*. But there is no lack of the various forms of direct repetition in *Érec*, in lines which recall corresponding passages

¹See Bédier's *Tristan*, Vol. I, p. 258, n. 3. Could this phrase have also been in Gace Brulé's mind when he wrote:

Qu'en ma dame est et ma mort et ma vie. (Poem VII, l. 54, of Huet's edition.)

See also Barbazan-Méon, *Fabliaux et Contes*, Vol. II, p. 57, l. 126, and Vol. IV, p. 444, l. 88.

of the *Brut*. Chrétien uses the repetition of single words for the purpose of producing lively narration:

Cil saut, cil tume, cil anchante,
Li uns conte, li autre chante,
Li uns siffle, li autre note,
Cil sert de harpe, cil de rote,
Cil de gigue, cil de vièle,
Cil flaute, cil chalemele. (2041-46 [cf. 2392-97, 5238-48])

Quite as conclusive of Wace's influence are the following lines, where the thought is emphasized by a juxtaposition of synonyms:

C'est mes deduiz, c'est mes deporz,
C'est mes solaz, c'est mes conforz,
C'est mes avoires, c'est mes tresors. (543-45 [cf. *Brut*, 6734 above])

or these which are more analytical:

Teus est amors, teus est nature,
Teus est pitiez de norreture. (1463, 1464)

Érec offers also several instances of the repetition of ideas in successive verses, but in quite different terms:

Cil recuevre, si l'a ferue
A descovert sor la main nue;
Si la fiert sor la main anverse. (183-85)
Erec cele part esperone,
Des esperons au cheval done. (205, 206)
Mout me poise quant l'an le dit;
Et por ce m'an poise ancor plus
Qu'il m'an metent le blasme sus;
Blasmee an sui, ce poise moi. (2558-61)
Sanblant an fist, quanqu'ele pot;
Mes n'an pot pas tel sanblant feire. (6638, 6639)

These last citations recall the repetitions of ideas which we observed in *Énéas* and *Éracle* quite as strongly as the first reminded us of the *Brut*. There are not any parallelisms in *Érec* which resemble the dialectics of Wace, nor are there plays on words.

With Chrétien's *Cligès* we find Wace's influence balanced by the more fashionable vogue of Thomas. From the former we can still trace the emphatic reiteration of the single word, coupled with an enumeration of qualities or synonyms:

Ce que ne puet feire hautesce
 Ne corteisie ne savoirs
 Ne jantillesce ne avoirs
 Ne force ne chevalerie
 Ne hardemanz ne seignorie
 Ne biautez ne nule autre chose. (202-7)
 Neant anbrace et neant beise,
 Neant tient et neant acole,
 Neant voit, a neant parole,
 A neant tance, a neant luite. (3360-63)

Also the repetition of ideas in successive lines by means of repetitions of distinctive words or plays on words is well represented in this poem of Chrétien:

S'Amors me chastie et manace
 Por moi aprandre et anseignier,
 Doi je mon mestre desdeignier?
 Fos est qui son mestre desdaingne.
 Ce qu'Amors m'aprant et ansaingne,
 Doi je garder et maintenir; (682-87)
 Que de nelui santez me vaingne,
 Se de la ne vient la santez,
 Don venue est l'anfermetez. (870-72)
 Cligés qui ce ot et escote
 Sist sor Morel, s'ot armeüre
 Plus noire que more meüre.
 Noire fu s'armeüre tote. (4662-65)
 Si li fait fiancier prison:
 Sagremors prison li fiance. (4692, 4693, etc., etc.)

On the contrary, the passages which contain analyses of sentiment and reiteration of words—and they recur at every step in *Cligès* (cf. 475-523; 1392-1418, etc., etc.)—are distinctively like the manner of Thomas, while the famous play on *la mer*, *amer*, and *l'amer* (548-52) has been recently determined by Gaston Paris to have been borrowed from a similar tautology in *Tristan*.¹

Chrétien's other poems, inclusive of *Guillaume d'Angleterre*, contain quite as many repetitions of words and phrases as the two we have considered. But because the fashion for dialectic reasoning seems to have enjoyed only a transitory life in romantic

¹ See *Journal des Savants*, July, 1902, pp. 354-56.

poetry, these later works show a decided diminution in the number of parallelisms obtained by means of plays on words. Of the remaining forms we notice in *Guillaume d'Angleterre* a strong liking for direct repetition of words, phrases, and ideas in successive lines or couplets (149-54 point toward an imitation of Wace's *Brut*), while *la Charrette* offers the greatest number of parallelisms recurring after an interval (cf. 2852, 2854; 3126, 3130; 3683, 3687; 3812, 3827, etc.).

The influence of the *Brut* is again strikingly manifest in the Douce *Folie Tristan*, which also showed a tendency toward transposed repetitions. Words and phrases are reiterated:

Murir desiret, murir volt, (20)
 Plentet i out de praerie,
 Plentet de bois, de venerie. (117, 118)
 Ysolt, pur vus tant me doil,
 Ysolt, pur vus ben murir voil.
 Ysolt, si ci me saviez. (169-71)

Again, ideas are repeated in the Douce *Folie*, in successive lines or at intervals, sometimes with repetition of parts of the original phrase, sometimes by using the device of a play on words:

En la nef nus mistrent en mer,
 Quant en haute mer nus meïmes, (463, 465)
 Certes de feintise ore me pleing,
 Ore vus vai retraite e fainte,
 Ore vus ai jo de feinte ateinte; (852-54 [cf. 746-52])

Both of the poems of Benoît de Sainte-More, the *Roman de Troie* and the *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie*, offer numerous instances of the simpler forms of direct repetition. They avoid, however, plays on words, analyses, and dialectics in general. Repetitions of single words in *Troie* include *maint* (2763-68), *sovent* (8610-15); in the *Chronique*, *virge* (24055-61). Repetitions of phrases in *Troie* are seen in *mielz sé* (10453-63), *par qui* (28298-305), and the couplet:

Por quei volez si tost morir?
 Por quei volez si tost guerpier? (15405, 15406)

In the *Chronique* we find *de tant* (37339-43) and the couplet:

Joie a sis quers e joie sent,
 E grant joie pleniére atent. (16082, 16083)

However, the repetitions in *Troie* are far more frequent than in the *Chronique*.

The same statement holds true of Wace's chronicle of *Rou*, which contains many repetitions of words and phrases, but does not show any pronounced partiality for the dialectics or word-analyses of the *Brut*. So with Wace's *St. Nicholas* and *Ste. Marguerite*, the *Münchener Brut*, the *Vie du Pape Grégoire*, and the fableau *Richeut* (1159). All these poems indulge in repetitions of words and phrases, but not in repetitions of lines. *Richeut*, to be sure, contains but one instance of a repetition (*or*, 403-5). On the other hand, the *Vie de Ste. Marie l'Égyptienne* repeats not only words and phrases, as *ne* (708-11), *tant mar* (406, 407), but the greater part of lines also:

Desk' atant k'il sent la mort.
Kant la mort vient e il la sent. (40, 41, etc.)
Je ne lui os turner mon vis.
Turner ne li os ma feiture (878, 879)
E sun nun n'avoit pas demande.
Ne que sun nun n'avoit enquis. (1350, 1351)

It will be noticed that, while these lines are consecutive, they occur in different couplets and in the first example resemble transposed parallelism.

Other and more romantic poems of the time present the same characteristics. The anonymous *Sept Sages* repeats words, phrases, and lines. An example of the last kind is:

Ne le puet plus faire airer.
Plus no puet l'on faire mairir. (2607, 2608)

The first version of *Floire et Blanchefleur* offers a still larger number of examples of this feature of style, and likewise more variety:

Ensamble vont, ensamble viennent. (213)
S'amie nous demandera?
Quant il demandera sa drue. (522, 523)
Grant doel en fait, et de sa mere.
Il et s'amie grant doel font. (2898, 2899)

A passage of this poem which contains grammatical rhymes is worth citing as quite unique in its way:

Jou vous feroie coroner
Et riche roiaume doner:
Riche roiaume vous donroie
Et d'or fin vous coroneroie. (2905-8)

It is not necessary to show how direct repetition of words and phrases, and repetition of ideas in the same or different words, in successive lines or separated by intervals, continued to form a prominent feature of style in mediæval French poetry. It had begun before the time of this first Romantic School. It went on after realism had fully asserted its sway. It is true that these forms of repetition do not occur after Wace's influence died out—after Marie de France, perhaps—so frequently as they did while the *Brut* was regarded as a model of good writing. But they are used whenever they suit the purpose of the poets, though it is quite probable that they were considered to be quite primitive ways of obtaining effects. Exception should be made, as we have already intimated, of the dialectic analytical parallelisms and plays on words which had been given to Thomas by Wace, elaborated by Thomas, and handed down by him to Chrétien. These forms, indeed, seem to have been endowed with as short a life as the forms of transposed parallelism. They were exotic and soon perished. The simpler kinds were natural and persisted. Unlike the more subtle, they did not form a school, but remained subject to the call of individual impulse. And probably because they were considered as commonplace, easy of use, they were not abused after the first outbursts of enthusiasm for literature in the vernacular had died away.

III. DIALOGUES IN ALTERNATE LINES AND IN THE SAME LINE

With the revival of French literature after the Crusade of 1147 the treatment of the dialogue attains considerable prominence. In both epic and narrative verse we come upon occasional passages where the poet is obviously exerting himself to express in alternate lines the self-uttered opinions of his characters, or even is dividing the same line between their arguments. The origin of either of these forms of debate at this time is by no means clear. Several centuries afterward, when the classical drama presents the same characteristics, we need only to look to its

models, the tragedies of Seneca, for abundant explanation of such peculiarities of style. But for poetry under Henry II or Louis VII reference to Seneca is meaningless. He may not have been known. Certainly he was not a standard of style. On the other hand, the clerks, to whom we are indebted for our first romantic poems, may have been influenced by the mannerisms of Terence, some of whose plays had been popular for a long time in the schools. Terence cultivates to a considerable degree the form of dialogue which is expressed in broken lines, lines in which two or more characters share. But he rarely, if ever, alternates his speeches in consecutive lines. To be sure, this latter feature is seen in Plautus, though not so frequently as the broken line, but Plautus may not have been read by the educators of that period.¹ Consequently, if we argue that the French poets borrowed the broken line from their Latin authors, we cannot assign the dialogue in alternate lines to this source. Besides, neither Gaimar's *Estorie* nor Wace's *Brut* uses either construction. And these pioneer works should have been especially affected by Latin models. There remains a possible explanation for this characteristic in the debates of the dialecticians, which may have tended toward a drill in dramatic expression.

Leaving the schools and going to the people, we might seek an origin for the dialogue in alternate lines in the liturgical plays of the mediæval drama. Learned in language, but popular in conception, the embryo mystery, the *trope* of the church service, furnished an ever-present model for vivid narration. It drew its thought and the greater share of its words from the Vulgate, but it was sung before the multitude in an antiphonal song which must have left its impression. Particularly well known was the *trope* of the Easter mass:

Quem queritis in sepulchro, o cristicolae?
—Jesum nazarenum crucifixum, o celicole.

This dialogue in alternate lines was familiar to the most illiterate. Could it not have affected the forms of debate in popular literature?

Even better known to the masses was the structure of the

¹ See W. Cloetta, *Komödie und Tragödie im Mittelalter*.

early lyric, the alternating phrases of folk-song. The remains of ballad poetry prove that its creators possessed to an unusual degree the capacity for dramatic exposition. This capacity must have been admired by both epic and narrative poets in the Middle Ages, and could have well been imitated by them when nearing a climax or desiring to vary their phrases. Yet dialogues in alternate lines are not to be found in *Roland* and its epic contemporaries, and their absence from these poems leaves the argument for ballad influence on this feature of style quite unsupported. Perhaps as plausible would be the surmise that dialogues in alternate lines are due to a natural evolution of dramatic expression, and that dialogues in broken lines are derived from them in turn by a further extension of the construction. We would not, however, minimize the significance of the liturgical *trope* or lyric reiteration in regard to the dialogues in alternate lines of mediæval poetry, while questions and answers included in the same line may have been justified in literary circles by the knowledge that so great an authority as Terence had deigned to employ them.

We have said that both kinds of dialogue are absent from the epic poems of the first period of French literature. The didactic poetry of the same time, however, offers in perhaps its earliest representative an instance of an apparent desire to elaborate the dialogue in alternate lines. Is it a half-way stage we come upon in *St. Alexis*?

Ço dist li pedre: "Chiers filz, com t'ai perduto!"

Respont la medre: "Lasse! qu'est devenuz?"

Ço dist la sponse: "Pechiez le m'at tolot." (106-8)

Artistic effort is certainly noticeable in this passage, notwithstanding its failure to attain completeness. But in what direction that effort may have led cannot be determined because the attempt stands by itself. Neither Philippe de Thaun nor the pious poets under Henry I appear to have followed up the hint which the author of *St. Alexis* gave them. And it is only with the French renaissance, after the Crusade of 1147, that the notion of giving artistic treatment to the dialogue seems to have been revived.

This revival was not started by the writers who were in close touch with the schools, Gaimar and Wace. After the fashion had

been set, we do, indeed, find Wace giving it a grudging adhesion in his *Rou* (1171-73, 1177 [broken line], 3707, 3708; 3913, 3914), possibly because he wished to keep in the literary current, and not because of a real liking for the mannerism. The real exponents of this feature of style are the romantic poets, the especial representatives of the new literary spirit.¹

The *Roman de Thèbes* first offers complete examples of both alternating and broken lines of dialogue. A serpent has killed a child, and the latter's nurse tells Capaneus about it:

- La pucèle li dist a tant:
 "Sire, j'ai perdu mon enfant.
 —Bèle, coment l'avez perdu?
 —Sire, une serpent l'a tolu.
 —Serpent?—Veire, sire, par fei: (2403-7)

Other passages of the text present the alternating kind only:

- Cil demande: "Coment, ço fu?
 —Par ma fei, sire, il l'a feru.
 —Et mis père nel referi?
 —Nen il, car donc l'eüst honi. (8061-64)
 Otes demande: "Avez respét?
 —Nenil, por veir, jusqu'a la nuét.
 —Por Deu, dist il, or aiez paiz, (8303-5)

In the variants of MSS B and C broken lines of dialogue may also be found (10006, 10066, 10077), and alternate lines as well (10079, 10080).

These passages, however, are few in number, and their very rarity shows that the author of *Thèbes* did not include such a treatment of the dialogue among the essentials of poetic art. A comparison with the examples of transposed parallelism in the same poem reveals the slight importance which the poet attached to dramatic expression. We may only infer from its presence that it was not a novelty. Had it made its first appearance here, it would have undoubtedly been given greater prominence.

¹ The twelfth-century version of *St. Alexis* bears witness to the tendency toward dramatic expression in dialogue. For instance, the verses of the original poem quoted above are reproduced quite faithfully in the revision, but the reference in two of the lines to the speaker is included within the speech:

"Dius," dist la mère, "qu'est mes flex devenus?"
 Çou dist li pères: "Peciés le m'a tolu."
 "Dius," dist l'esponse "com petit l'ai eu!"

(edition, p. 234, ll. 453-57 [cf. p. 228, ll. 223-25])

The assumption just drawn may receive support from the subsequent history of this feature of style. Neglected in *Thèbes*, it was employed almost to prodigality in *Énéas*. Transposed parallelism had been excluded in all its forms from the latter poem. Was it a declaration of independence of the authority of *Thèbes* which prompted the author of *Énéas* to this omission, and incited him to the development of the kinds of dramatic dialogue? Whatever may have been his animus, the fact is that he cultivated with extraordinary zeal the art of forceful expression, particularly the dialogue in broken lines. The first opportunity to show his colors was gladly welcomed. Æneas questions the messengers returning from Carthage:

- “Qu’avez trouvé?—Nos bien.—Et quei?
 —Cartage.—Parlastes al rei?
 —Nenil.—Por quei?—N’i a seignor.
 —Quei donc?—Dido maintient l’enor.
 —Parlastes vos o li?—Oil.
 —Menace nos?—Par fei, nenil.
 —Et que dist donc?—Pramet nos bien. (645-51)

Afterward the broken line is combined with the alternating line:

- “Anna, ge muir, ne vivrai, suer.
 —Quei avez donc?—Falt me li cuer,
 Nel puis celer, jo aim.—Et cui?
 —Gel te dirai; par fei, celui . . .

(1273-76 [cf. 1677-81; 1684, 1685; 1750-58])

In later conversations we find the whole line alternating (7892-99; 8002-4; 8470-72, etc.), the broken line by itself (7953-55), or the broken and alternating line in combination (7935-42; 8488-97; 8623-28, etc.). Furthermore, there is an interesting use of the broken line (and also of the alternate line) in those passages of the erotic monologues where the victim of love debates with himself (8133-48; 8347-52; 8961-81, etc.). Here we are approaching the methods of scholastic analysis and argument in which we might perhaps find a source for this feature of style. But whatever their origin, the number and variety of dialogue passages in *Énéas* easily place this poem before all others in the use of such dramatic constructions.

While the author of *Énéas* makes frequent use of alternate lines to express a dialogue, and evidently prides himself on carrying dialogues between two characters in the same line to an extreme, the author of the other great romance of the period which drew its theme from ancient tradition, Benoît de Sainte-More, returns in his *Troie* to the frugality of *Thèbes*. Notwithstanding the great length of *Troie*, there is possibly but one instance in it where the dialogue is expressed in either alternating or broken lines (25320, 25321). But Benoît's other poem, the *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie*, makes more concessions to this feature of style. To be sure, its examples are infrequent, yet in the case of dialogues in alternate lines they are quite extended (cf. ll. 16908-16, 28556-66, etc.). The dialogue in broken lines occurs in combination with its fellow (ll. 16761, 16762).

With Benoît we have reached the end of the period with which we are directly concerned, and may now turn back to other kinds of literature written a decade or more earlier. For it is an interesting fact that the dramatic form of dialogue had invaded the domain of epic poetry even. The *Chançon de Willame*, which gave such valuable testimony to the popularity of transposed parallelism, may be also adduced as witness to the favor with which these dialogue constructions were regarded. It knows both the alternating line:

Dame Guibure, desquant guardas ma porte?—
 Par ma fai, sire, de novel le faz ore.
 Sire quons Willame, mult as petite force.—
 Seor, duce amie, desquant ies mun porter?—
 Par ma fei, sire, de novel, nient de vielz.
 Sire Willame, poi en remeines chevalers. (1281-86).

There is a ballad flavor in the repetition of this passage, which may accuse its origin. But in the case of the broken lines of dialogue in the poem the flavor is wanting:

Qui estes vus?—Ço est Willame al Curbnies. (2216)
 Ne vient il dunc?—Nun, dame.—Ço m'est laid. (2801)
 Cum avez nun?—Reneward m'apelez. (2826)

Subsequent poems of the William of Orange cycle follow the example set by their predecessor. In the *Couronnement Louis* both forms are found, the alternating line alone (cf. ll. 1753-55, 1789-91), or in combination with the broken line (cf. ll. 1458, 1459). This is also true, to a less degree, of the *Charroi de Nismes* (alternate: ll. 1289, 1290; broken: l. 1132), and the *Prise d'Orange* (alternate: ll. 522-24; broken: l. 479). The form in alternate lines is adopted also by other cycles, and becomes the ordinary means of attaining dramatic power in hostile argument.¹

In narrative poetry the fableau of *Richeut*,² which is dated 1159, shows familiarity with both the alternating and broken-line forms:

- Po de chose
 Avez rien fait?—Oil.—Quel chose? (1145, 1146)
 Florie, fait il, Dex vos saut,
 Li Fiz Marie!
 —Sanson, Dex te beneie!
 —Don n'est encor venue m'amie?
 —Nenil, amis.
 —Que diz?—Sanson trop ies hastis. (1214-19)

The first version of the romantic poem of *Floire et Blanche-fleur*, but a few years younger than *Richeut*, knows also both kinds and develops them to an extent that recalls the intensity of *Énéas*:

- "Dame," fait il, "ou est m'amie?"
 Cele respont! "El n'i est mie.
 —Ou est?—Ne sai.—Vous l'appellez.
 —Ne sai quel part.—Vous me gabez.
 Celez la vous?—Sire, nonal.
 —Par Deu, fait il, gou est gieu mal.
 (673-78 [cf. 287; 875, 876; 962, 963; 2283])

Among the court poets of the sixties who are known to us by name, Gautier d'Arras is foremost in adopting this feature of style. This was to have been expected, for Gautier, as we have seen, possessed little originality and independence of initiative.

¹ Cf. Girard de Roussillon in P. Meyer's *Recueil d'anciens textes*, p. 57, ll. 349-54; *Garin le Loherain* (4535-38, 6665-70), etc.

² See Méon's *Nouveau recueil de fabliaux et contes*, Vol. I.

Fearful of being eclipsed by the better writers of his time, he was ever mindful of adorning his verse and phrase with the embellishments in vogue for the moment. He is thus a true eclectic, a representative of what is fashionable in literature, and a study of his poems reveals the changing mannerisms of his masters in literary style. Therefore, while our comparison of his *Éracle* with the later *Ille et Galeron* indicated that transposed parallelism had fallen from court grace during the interval between the composition of those poems, a similar comparison in regard to the subject we are now treating shows that there had been no appreciable change in the fashion of handling dialogue passages. Both *Éracle* and *Ille et Galeron* contain speeches where the conversation between two characters is carried on, now in alternate lines, now in the same line. And the proportion of such speeches is practically the same in both poems. For dialogues in alternate lines see *Éracle*, 309, 310; 875, 876; 4672, 4673; 4949, 4950; *Ille et Galeron*, 1829, 1830; 3608, 3609; 3663-65; 6407-9; 6509-11. For dialogues in broken lines see *Éracle*, 537; 544; 560; 923; 1530; 3587; 3698; 3885; 4399; *Ille et Galeron*, 1521; 3615; 3729; 5585; 5588; 6360; 6418. It will be noticed that the examples of either kind are quite unimportant and do not exceed two lines in length, with the exception of a passage in *Éracle* where both forms occur in combination:

Je pert m'onneur, mais n'en puis mais.
— Si puez. — Coment? — Esta en pais.
— Je nel puis trouver en men cuer. (3686-88)

The most interesting feature of this passage is that it occurs in a monologue, a debate held by the heroine of the episode with herself, after the manner of the love monologues in *Énéas*. In view of this particular correspondence, and similar debates in the monologue of the hero which follows, together with the relative frequency of both varieties of dialogue in the poem, we may assume that *Éracle* was written after *Énéas* and took this notion of literary style from the greater romance.

The same assumption may probably hold in the case of Thomas' *Tristan*. For while we find but one extended use of

broken and alternate lines to express a dialogue, this passage occurs in the midst of a debate carried on by Tristan with himself over the genuineness of Isolt's love for him:

Ele, de quei?—D'icest ennui.
 —U me trovereit?—La u jo sui.
 —Si ne set u ne en quel tere.
 —Nun? e si me feïst dunc querre!
 —A que faire?—Pur ma dolur. (139-43)

Both the situation and the manner here recall Lavinia's monologue in *Énéas* so vividly that we are led to trace a connection between the two passages and surmise that one is the model for the other. And because *Énéas* apparently lays greater stress on this feature of style than *Tristan*, where we find but one other, inferior, example—alternating lines in a monologue of Isolt's (2935, 2936)—we assume that the model was furnished by *Énéas*, and not *Tristan*. Unfortunately the *Douce Folie*, which is possibly a work of Thomas, cannot throw much light on this point, for it offers but one good example of a dialogue in alternating lines (486-88), together with one poor one (384, 385), and it does not contain any dialogues in broken lines.

Chrétien de Troies may also have known *Énéas* when he wrote his first Arthurian romance of *Érec*, but his treatment of the dialogue in that poem is not pronounced enough to indicate a more positive authority than *Thèbes* would be. We do not find any conversations in alternating lines in *Érec*. There seem to be two instances where a speech is restricted to a single line (851, 3258). Twice the line is broken between two interlocutors (4372, 6615), but only in the second passage is the dialogue complete. Once two broken lines occur together, but here the first hemistich of the first line is only the conclusion of remarks which were begun two lines before:

Leisse m'aler!—Vos n'i iroiz!
 —Je si ferai.—Vos non feroiz! (215, 216)

So that at best the showing in *Érec* is extremely meager and inconclusive.

But in *Cligès*, which was composed, as we have seen, under the inspiration of *Tristan*, illustrations of this feature of style are more numerous and more pertinent. Broken lines of debate with themselves emphasize the anxiety of lovers in their monologues—a trait bequeathed by *Tristan* (cf. *Cligès*, 504, 505; 627; 653; 665; 698, combined with single-line speech in 699 ff.); while dialogues in alternate or broken lines between two characters quite rival in perfection the best passages of *Énéas*:

- Don estes vos?—De Grece somes.
 —De Grece?—Voire.—Qui'st tes pere?
 —Par ma foi, sire, l'anperere.
 —Et comant as non, biaux amis?
 —Alixandre me fu nons mis. (*Cligès* 366-70)
 Dame, que dire? que teisir?
 Congié vos quier.—Congié? De quoi?
 —Dame, an Bretaingne aler an doi.
 —Donc me dites, por quel besoingne. (4308-11)

The remaining poems of Chrétien continue to use this mannerism, *la Charrette* sparingly, *Iwain* and *Perceval* freely. *Guillaume d'Angleterre* knows both forms, but in its handling of the broken line excels even *Énéas*:

- Donc le me vant!—Mout volantiers.
 —Que t'an donrai?—Cinc souz antiers.
 —Cinc souz?—Voire.—Tu les avras,
 (*Guillaume d'Angleterre*, 2099-2101)
 Un roi?—Voire.—Don?—D'Angleterre. (2813)
 Ainz sont vostre charnel ami.
 —Ami? Comant?—Vostre fil sont.
 —Deus, fet la dame, qui respont:
 Puet estre voirs?—Ôil, sanz dote. (3106-9)

As might be expected this artistic handling of dialogue passages did not cease with the poets who wrote in the third quarter of the twelfth century. Their successors took it up and contributed to make it a permanent adjunct of literary style. But its period of elaboration is distinctly to be bounded by *Thèbes* on the one hand and *Énéas* on the other—a period not exceeding ten years, in all probability. An attempt to develop the form in

alternate lines may be traced perhaps as far back as the *St. Alexis*, but this attempt first attained success in *Thèbes* and *Thèbes* also furnished the first example of a dialogue in broken lines. (This statement is made on the assumption that *Thèbes* antedates the *Willame*.) But the author of *Thèbes* does not display any great satisfaction over his victory, if it be his, and it was reserved for *Énéas* to develop dramatic dialogue to its greatest capacity. For in applying it to erotic monologues so that the lover can debate with himself, the author of *Énéas* made possible many an episode of mediæval literature. Thomas saw its capabilities, and Chrétien also, while their successors only confirmed their practice. Among the contemporaries Wace and Benoît de Sainte-More pay a reluctant homage to this construction, but the time-serving Gautier d'Arras accepts its sway enthusiastically and vaunts his fealty even to the debates with self of his erotic monologues.

F. M. WARREN.

YALE UNIVERSITY.



VENTAILLE

Skeat's explanation of *aventaille*¹ in the lines in Chaucer's *Lenvoy to the Clerke's Tale* (C. T., Group E., 1202-4):

For though thyn housbonde armed be in maille,
The arwes of thyn crabbed eloquence
Shal perce his brest, and eke his aventaille,

hardly hits the mark. After citing Douce's perfectly correct account of the *ventail*, or "beaver," of the helmet of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, "the lower part of the helmet which admitted air," he goes on to say: "Jephson states that *and eek his aventaille* is a perfect example of bathos. I fail to see why; the weapon that pierced a ventail would pass into the head and inflict a death wound."² That Jephson's view of the matter is the correct one will be evident from what follows.

More than forty years ago Quichérat cited the Chaucerian passage most aptly in his *Explication du mot ventaille dans les chansons de geste*,³ an article written in part to correct the traditional error of French dictionaries on the same point. His conclusions have been accepted by the most prominent French scholars,⁴ but seem to be generally unknown to Middle-English scholars;⁵ so it may be well to make a restatement of his results,

¹ In his edition of *William of Palerne*, p. 254, Skeat's definition, "The movable front to a helmet, and through which the wearer breathed," and the quotation from Cotgrave—a definition of the "beaver"—cannot explain the passage referred to (3608, 3609):

william than wistli by the auentayle him hent
to have with his swerd swapped of his hed.

The English translator at this point has made a very free rendering of his French original (*Guillaume de Palerne*, ed. Michelant, 6208, cf. 6231), but neither here, in the original and in the translation, nor elsewhere in the French text (5767, 5970-74, 6614, 6830, 6837, 6866, 6882; cf. Kaluza, *Eng. Stud.*, IV, pp. 252, 253, 269) is the *ventaille* a part of the helmet.

² *Works of Chaucer*, V., 352.

³ *Mém. de la Soc. des Antiq. de France*, 3, VII (1864), 231ff.; reprinted in his *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, II (1886), 314 ff.

⁴ E. g., Littré, *Dict.*, s. v. *aventail*; P. Meyer, *La chanson de la croisade contre les Albigeois*, I (1875), 447; L. Favre (Sainte Palaye, *Dict. hist. de l'ancien langage françois*, X, 141). For Godefroi the *ventaille* is a part of the helmet, although a number of his citations belie his definition, *Dict. de l'anc. lang. franc.*, VIII, 174; cf. I, 510.

⁵ Cf. R. Morris, *Sir Gawayne*, p. 86; Bradley-Stratmann, *Middle-Eng. Dict.*, s. v. *aventaille*; Köbling, *Sir Bevis of Hantown*, pp. 369, 398; N. E. D., s. v. *aventail*, where the definition of a beaver is given. Kaluza, *Libeaus Desconus*, p. 20, corrects this error by a reference 541]

supplemented with other evidence.¹ In French armor of the tenth to the fourteenth centuries an essential part of the hauberk, or coat of mail, was the hood-shaped headdress of chain-mail, the *coiffe*, which, covering the back of the neck and the head, left only the lower part of the face unprotected.² The helmet was placed on top, and fastened to the *coiffe*.³ The opening in the *coiffe* through which the wearer breathed was known as the *ventaille*. No instance of its use in its primitive etymological sense can be cited, as at an early date the word was applied to a part of the armor itself. At first it denoted a wide strip of chain-mail which was attached to, or formed part of, the *coiffe*. Hanging down from the right cheek, it was brought round the chin, and, protecting the neck and upper breast, covered the mouth and left cheek, and was fastened on the top of the head with laces.⁴ It thus performed the double service of protecting the parts of the body it covered, and of securing the *coiffe* in place. At a later period the *coiffe* did not form one piece with the hauberk, and hung low down in front, either inside it or outside.⁵ The word *ventaille* had an extension in its meaning parallel to the evolution of the piece of armor,⁶ when it did not supplant *coiffe* as the name of the whole piece of armor.⁷

to Schultz (see below). I have already cited some of the authorities in a note on the use of the word in *T. and C.*, V, 1558 in my *Chaucer's Indebtedness to Guido delle Colonne* (1903), p. 90 n. For parallels to the *Troilus* passage, cf. note 1 *supra*; *Guillaume de Pal.*, 6231, 6234; *Alliscans*, ed. Wienbeck, etc., 5968.

¹ Quichérat, *Hist. du costume en France*, 133, 288; Viollet-le-Duc, *Dict. du mobilier français*, VI, 353-57, Plates, 106-7; V. Schirling, *Die Verteidigungswaffen im altfranzösischen Epos*, 43 ff.; A. Schultz, *Das höfische Leben*, 2d ed., II (1889) 50 ff.; O. Hartung, *Herrigs Archiv*, LXXXIX, 281, 372; E. du Ménil, *Études sur quelques points d'archéologie* (1862), 270, 509; W. Foerster, *Atol*, p. 607.

² Quichérat, *Mél.*, 316-19; *Hist. du cost.*, 133; Schultz, 50, 51; Schirling, 40-42.

³ Quichérat, *Mél.*, 316, 319; Schultz, 53, 55, 78; Schirling, 41, 69.

⁴ Quichérat, *Mél.*, 322, 323; Schultz, 51-55.

⁵ Quichérat *Mél.*, 319, 320; *Hist.*, 238. The *coiffe* was also called *clavain* when it did not form part of the hauberk. Cf. Godefroi, II, 148; Schultz, II, 55; Schirling, 42; *Rom.*, XI, 565. As to the identity of the *clavain* and *clavel* cf. authorities cited by Levy, *Provenzalisches Supplement-Wörterbuch*, I, 260, 261.

⁶ *Huon de Bordeaux*, 8051; *Fierabras*, 4686, 5677; *Maugis d'Aigremont*, 6434, 6435; Schultz, 54, n. 3.

⁷ Quichérat *Mél.*, 321, *Hist.*, 288; W. Foerster, *Kristian von Troyes, Karrenritter*, p. 384; *Garin le Loherain*, I, 164, 4; *Elie de Saint Gilles*, ed. Foerster, 2101. For a similar semantic evolution of the Germanic *halsbære* cf. Lehmann, *Brünne und Helm im ags. Beowulflied*, 20-22; Kinzel, *Zeit. f. deutsch. Phil.*, XIII, 123; Lichenstein, *Anz. f. d. Alterth.*, VIII, 93.

The Latin etymon *ventacula* of the French word and its Provençal equivalent *ventalha* at once suggest that the piece of armor was an innovation made on Gallic soil, and there is reason to believe that, like the hauberk and helmet,¹ it was an article of Provençal manufacture, which was imported to northern France. For in Provençal *ventalha* is not only the name of a part of the armor;² at an early date it was applied to a part of the everyday costume. In the lines of the *Eusenhamen* of Arnaut Guilhem de Marsan:³

E faitz la cabessalha
atraves ab ventalha
ampla pels muscles sus,
car lo pieytz n'er pus clus;
e dirai vos per que,
e aprendetz o be;
per so c'om res no veyà
el pieys que mal esteya,

the *ventalha* is the part of a cape, or collar of a cloak,⁴ which fastens it up in front. The *ventaille* has no such meaning in Old French; and if its meaning, as a part of the dress,⁵ was restricted to a military habilliment, was this not due to the fact that northern France received the name with the piece of armor? That it was not of Germanic origin is evident from the fact that Middle High German translators of French texts⁶ had no word with which to render *ventaille*, and made it synonymous with the *coiffe*, *hersenier*.⁷ Only in translations of a later period does the

¹ G. Paris, *Rom.*, XVII, 425-29.

² E. g., *Ch. des Alb.*, 2525, Bertrand de Born, ed. Stimming (1892), XVII, 35; XXXVIII, 55. But that the second of these poems is falsely attributed to Bertrand, cf. Schultz Gora, *Deutsches Literaturzeit.*, 1892, 1177.

³ K. Bartsch, *Provenz. Lesebuch*, 136, 27-34. The date of the poem is ca. 1200. Bartsch, *Grundriss*, p. 51; Stimming, *Groebers Grundr.*, II, 2, 51.

⁴ On the meaning of *cabessalha* see Levy, *Prov. Suppl.-Wörterb.*, I, 180. Add to his reference Godefroy, s. v. *cheveceure*, and the citation "ele (i. e., une cotele) n'avoit mie la chevecheure de traveis sus les espaules," a perfect comment on the Provençal passage. On etymology cf. Horning, *Zeit. f. rom. Phil.*, XVIII, 234.

⁵ On the meaning of *éventail* cf. Godefroy, VIII, 174; P. Meyer, *Flam.*, 2d ed., 410.

⁶ In Lamprecht's translation of Albéric de Besançon's poems on Alexander the episodes of the arming of the hero, and his fight with Nicholas, are very much abridged (cf. P. Meyer, *Alex. le Grand*, II, 124, 126-31; Wilmanns, *Götting. gel. Anz.*, 1885, 298-301; Kinzel, *Anz. f. d. A.*, XIII, 228, 230); so there is no chance of seeing the translation of *ventalha*, when it occurs in the Provençal text (cf. Meyer, *loc. cit.*, I, MS de l'Arsenal, 365, 370, 647, 703).

⁷ Cf. *Rom. de Troie*, ed. Joly, 2565, 16169, with Herbort von Fritzlar, *Liet von Troye*, 460 ff., 10330 ff.; Lichenstein, *Anz. f. d. A.*, 3, VIII, 91.

loan-word *vintelle* appear.¹ It seems as if only after the *ventaille* had become a part of the helmet was the French word drafted into Italian as *ventaglia*,² there is no example of it in early Italian, where we find *barbuda* with the wider meaning of *coiffe*.³ In Spanish *ventaille* has been translated by *ventana*,⁴ a word of native growth with the same meaning as the etymological meaning of the French word. *Ventaille* and *aventaille*—the latter form due to agglutination with the feminine definite article—passed into Middle English without any change in either form or meaning.

It was with this early type of armor, in which the *ventaille* was a part of the *coiffe*, and not of the helmet, that Chaucer was acquainted, and protecting the breast as the *aventaille* did, the English poet's lines are "a perfect example of bathos." A few instances of a correct description of the results of a blow from a weapon will show the truth of this statement. The two earliest examples are in the *Chanson de Roland*:

Si vait ferir Escremiz de Valterne,
L'escut del col li fraint et escantelet:
De sun osbere li rumpit la ventaille:
Sil fiert el piz entre les dous furceles,
Vait le ferir par sun grant vasselage,
L'escut li fraint, cuntre le coer li quasset,
De sun osbere li disrumpit la ventaille,
Son grant espiet parmi le cors passet,⁵

¹ Grimm, *D. Gr.*, III, 445, has erred in defining the word as a part of the helmet, and in following him Benecke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, III, 325, only gives the definition *helmvier* which does not apply to a single one of the passages cited; and the error is not corrected by Lexer, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterb.* III, 330, or Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterb.*, I, 197.

² Cf. d'Ovidio, *Arch. glott.*, XIII, 425. It is not cited by Thomas in his list of French loan-words, in Italian, *Essais de philol. franç.*, 404, 405.

³ *El Cançare di Fierabracci e Ulivieri*, ed. Stengel, 1004; *Orlando*, ed. Häbscher, I, 10; VX, 40; XXXVII, 35, XLIX, 34, 38-40. Cf. Du Cange, s. v. *barbuda*; Levy, I, 126, 127. In the passage cited by Raynouard *barbuda* is not the piece of armor, but the part of the body covered by it. Cf. Ascoli, *AG.*, VII, 520; Zauner, *R. F.*, XIV, 408; F. Zambaldi, *Vocab. etimol. ital.*, 108d.

⁴ Cf. *La Gran Conquista de Ultramar*, II, cxxvii, p. 261b; *Chanson d'Antioch*, VIII, 508; G. Paris, *Rom.* XVII, 519, XIX, 589.

⁵ *Ch. de Rol.* 1291-94, 3447-49a; MS O. Stengel in his critical edition has unfortunately rejected the good reading in O for 1293, in favor of that given in MSS due to scribes, who did not understand the meaning of *ventaille*, as is evident from the omission of 3449. The same sort of omissions and changes was made by the scribe of the prototype of the first part of the Berne MS of the *Aliscans*, who knew only the *ventaille* of the helmet. Cf. *Aliscans*, ed. Wienbeck, 1662, 1689, 4004, 4007, 4070, 4564, p. xxxi.

written at a period when the *coiffe* still formed a part of the hauberk. In the other instances cited below, from later texts, the *ventaille* is quite evidently not considered a part of the hauberk, as was, in all probability, the case in Chaucer's lines:

Chanson de la Croisade contre les Albigeois:¹

Aucizon .i. donzel, c'anc ausberg ni ventalha
Nol pog gander de mort, que dins la coralha
Ne li messol cairel co per .i. sac de palha;

Orson de Beauvais:²

. La vantalle li frosse et perce la cuirie,
Le cuer li a fendi, le premon et le fie;

Roman d'Alexandre:³

Tel cop li a done el pis sor la ventalle,
Le fier de son espiel li met en la coralle;

Laud Troy-Book:⁴

Smot in-to helme and mayle
Coleret and the ventayle:
He carff him down Into his vent;

Sir Ferumbas:⁵

Ro<land> smot hym on the helm an heȝ, & laid hit a doun with mayn,
Helm and coyfe therwyt a clef, þorw-out heued & brayn.
His auentaile ne vailede him noȝt, that þe swerd ne clef him þanne,
Til it hadde in-to his bodi i-soȝt, by-nythe is brest a spanne.

Is it not clear that in the English poet's lines, as in the examples cited above, the piercing of the breast and *ventaille* is to be regarded as one and the same act? If Chaucer's description is incorrect, it is a part of the poet's fun to use here in his own way a formula common in metrical romances, as he had used numerous such formulas in *Sir Thopas*. We find the same rhetorical fault, perhaps unintentional this time, in the *Sowdone of Babylone*,⁶

He smote with mayne and myghte
The nekke asonder, the ventayle also,

¹ Ed. P. Meyer, 2535-37.

² Ed. G. Paris, 1668, 1669.

³ Ed. Michelant, 305, 32, 33.

⁴ Ed. Walfing, 7493-7495.

⁵ Ed. Herrtage, 1602-1605. There is no equivalent for this passage in the French *Fierabras*, 2413-16.

⁶ Ed. Hausknecht, ll. 528, 529.

since it was necessary to remove the *ventaille* in order to cut off the head.¹ As the *ventaille* did protect the lower part of the face, a severe blow on the former implied wounding the latter, but in every case the injury done the armor and the face is the result of a single blow:

Aliscans:²

Li quens le fiert devant en mi la chiere
Du brant d'acier, qui fu fait en Baviere,
De la ventaille li rompi la joiere,
Tote la face li fençû par derriere;

Roman de Troie:³

L'escu li perce e la ventaille,
Iluec li fist sis haubers faille:
Par mi la chiere l'a navré;

Fierabras:⁴

Hardré a si feru du puig deles l'oie
Que .ii. dens en la geule li pechoie et esmie:
Se ne fust la ventaille que il avoit lacie,
Du felon traiteur en fust Franche widie.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

¹ *Destruction de Rome* (*Rom.* II, 26); *Rouland and Vernagu*, ed. Herriage, 863, 864; *Octavian*, ed. Sarrasin, 1153, 1154; Schultz, 54, 55.

² Ed. Wienbeck, p. 346, 22-25.

³ Ed. Constans, 2579-81.

⁴ Ed. Kroeber and Servois, 5845-48; cf. English translation, *Sir Ferumbas*, 5640-52.

